

University of Tampere

Teachers' Perceptions and their Interventions toward Bullying at
Aceh Modern Islamic Boarding Schools
(*Pesantren*)

Marthunis and Nailul Authar
University of Tampere
Faculty of Education
Master's Thesis
February 2017

University of Tampere

Faculty of Education

MARTHUNIS & NAILUL AUTHAR: Teachers' Perceptions and their Interventions toward Bullying at Aceh Modern Islamic Boarding Schools (*Pesantren*)

Master's thesis in education, 97 pages, 7 appendices

February 2017

The research topic of teachers' perceptions and interventions toward bullying behavior at the two selected modern *pesantren* in Aceh is examined through *phenomenographical* and phenomenological study. The study focuses on obtaining substantial information of teachers' perceptions and their interventions in the bullying problem in the modern *pesantren* environment. *Pesantren* is an equivalent to boarding school which facilitates students with formal schooling and dormitory facility. The additional feature of the *pesantren* which is different from boarding school in general is Islamic studies content. *Pesantren* are suspected for frequent bullying occurrence due to continuous interaction among students at school and in their residential setting, thus, teachers' appropriate perceptions and interventions are two crucial issues which need to be investigated. This study provides an analysis of how teachers at the *pesantren* conceptually perceive bullying behavior and their concrete actions to prevent the behavior.

This study attempts to uncover information of the teachers' perceptions and their interventions in the bullying problem *phenomenographically* from 10 teachers of the two selected *pesantren*. This study also interviews 7 students from both *pesantren* to confirm the data obtained from the teachers' interviews. The research data of this study is comprised of interviews of teachers, students, and observation of the participants. The key categories of the study involve various aspects of the bullying issue and teachers' interventions such as: bullying is related to teasing, mocking or name calling, bullying is related to the physical attack of seniors to juniors, bullying is related to threatening, and bullying is caused by school culture, intervening by using *pesantren* policy, intervening by advising, intervening by mediation, intervening by parents' meeting, and intervening by physical sanction. These categories are approached from theoretical as well as practical viewpoints and aim to build a holistic understanding of the teachers' perceptions and interventions of bullying behavior at the *pesantren*.

The theoretical basis to teachers' perception and their interventions of the issue discusses several previous studies concerning teachers' perception of bullying behavior globally and also several theoretical perspectives of the reasons behind bullying problem such as; social identity theory, social cognitive learning and modelling, and socio-ecological theory. At the core of the theoretical framework, Urie Bronfenbrenner outlines that the individual is an inseparable element of a social system consisted of four interconnected systems; microsystem, mesosystem, *exosystem*, and *macrosystem*, and those systems are the basis for bullying occurrence.

The study reveals that the teachers at the *pesantren* perceive bullying as a dangerous behavior which needs to be tackled. The study also discovers that the teachers at the *pesantren* employ several interventions in the form of reactive approach rather than proactive. However, the fascinating finding from the present research is that the teachers' positive perceptions (bullying is harmful) and their concrete actions to prevent bullying within the *pesantren* community cannot reduce its occurrence significantly. Particularly, teasing, mocking or name-calling is becoming the habit, tradition, and culture in the *pesantren* environment.

Keywords: bullying, *pesantren*, teachers' perceptions, teachers' intervention.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Purpose and Research Questions.....	4
2	LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1	Bullying Definition.....	5
2.1.1	Age-related Changes in Bullying Definition	7
2.2	Bullying Perception	9
2.2.1	How Teachers' Perceive Bullying Behavior	11
2.2.2	Teasing: An Ambiguous Bullying Form	14
2.3	Pesantren and Bullying Issue.....	16
2.4	The Effect of Bullying	19
2.5	Why People Bully: The Theoretical Perspectives	21
2.5.1	Social Influence	21
2.5.2	Social Cognitive Learning and Modeling.....	24
2.5.3	Socio-ecological Theory.....	25
2.6	The Bullying Intervention	27
2.6.1	The Approaches Employed to intervene bullying	30
3	METHODOLOGY.....	33
3.1	Research Design.....	33
3.1.1	Qualitative Research.....	34
3.1.2	The In-depth Interview	37
3.1.3	Participant Observation	39
3.2	Data Analysis	42
3.3	Ethical Consideration	44
4	FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS.....	45
4.1	Categories Related to the Teachers' Perceptions of Bullying Behavior.....	45

4.1.1 Category 1: Bullying is related to teasing, mocking or name calling.....	47
4.1.2 Category 2: Bullying is related to the physical attack of seniors on juniors	51
4.1.3 Category 3: Bullying is related to threatening.....	54
4.1.4 Category 4: Bullying is caused by school culture	56
4.2 Categories Related to the Teachers' Interventions to Prevent Bullying.....	60
4.2.1 Category 5: Intervening by using <i>pesantren</i> policy.....	60
4.2.2 Category 6: Intervening by advising	63
4.2.3 Category 7: Intervening by mediation	66
4.2.4 Category 8: Intervening by parents' meeting	68
4.2.5 Category 9: Intervening by physical sanction	70
4.3 Other Relevant Observations.....	72
5 CONCLUSION.....	77
5.1 Implication of the Research Findings.....	77
5.2 Recommendations for further Research	81
REFERENCES	83
APPENDIX 1	92
APPENDIX 2	95
APPENDIX 3	97

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Categories related to the teachers' perception of bullying behavior.....	46
Table 2: Referential and structural aspects of Category 1	49
Table 3: Referential and structural aspects of Category 2	52
Table 4: Referential and structural aspects of Category 3	55
Table 5: Referential and structural aspects of Category 4	57
Table 6: Categories related to the teachers' intervention to prevent bullying	60
Table 7: Referential and structural aspects of Category 5	62
Table 8: Referential and structural aspects of Category 6	64
Table 9: Referential and structural aspects of Category 7	67
Table 10: Referential and structural aspects of Category 8	69
Table 11: Referential and structural aspects of Category 9	71

1 INTRODUCTION

Pesantren is an educational institution for Muslims in Indonesia which usually comprises a *pondok* (dormitory facility) and a formal schooling (Srimulyani, 2007). “Today, there are generally two kinds of *pesantren* found almost everywhere in Indonesia, *salafi* (traditional) and *khalafi* (modern)” (Raihani, 2001, p. 22). The *pesantren salafi* (traditional) merely employ the traditional Islamic teaching or *kitab kuning* (classical Islamic textbook), while *pesantren khalafi* (modern) adopt formal secular education (Raihani, 2001). In addition, Aceh, as one of the provinces in Indonesia which is regulated by Islamic law, has many Islamic boarding schools (*Pesantren/Dayah*). Based on the survey of Aceh Islamic Boarding Schools Board for Education and Development (Badan Pembinaan dan Pendidikan Dayah, 2016) in 2014 there were 1.054 *pesantren* in Aceh (634 traditional and 420 modern). In Aceh, the term “Dayah” is typically used by Acehnese people to label *pesantren*, however, *pesantren* itself is also well-known in Aceh.

Moreover, Aceh, with its Islamic principles, tries to uphold Islamic values as the most important aspect in the lives of Acehnese people, also in education (Nilan, 2008). Religious values become the most vital educational standard and goal for most parents in Aceh. As a result, they send their children to *pesantren* to achieve these objectives. The trend of sending children to *pesantren* started in the two last decades. Before the peace agreement between Indonesia’s government and the Movement for a Free Aceh (Gerakan Aceh Merdeka, GAM) in 2005, most traditional Muslim communities sent their children to *pesantren salafi* to avoid the conflict, since the institutions are respected by both GAM and the Indonesian Army (Tentara Negara Indonesia, TNI) (Vignato, 2012). Recently, parents from moderate Muslim families send their children to *pesantren khalafi* in order to

protect them from the negative influence of the westernized world cultures and values and to internalize strong Islamic values (Nilan, 2008). The form of modern *pesantren* was initially pioneered by *pesantren* Gontor in 1926 (a *pesantren* in Ponorogo, East Java), and now it is becoming one of the most favorite types of educational institutions in Indonesia, including Aceh. The integration between religious instructions and secular studies, the implementation of 24 hour supervision, and the emphasis on using Arabic and English as the languages of instruction makes these kinds of institutions preferable to most parents (Pohl 2006; Hady, 2012). Thus, the authors will limit the research object of this study to the modern *pesantren*.

Furthermore, respecting others and not harming anybody physically, mentally and socially is one of the objectives in Islamic teaching within the *pesantren* setting. The religious instructions are strongly present in the modern *pesantren* atmosphere, yet still behavior problems among *santri* (the student) occur, including bullying. As *santri* (the students) in the modern *pesantren* spend 24 hours to live in the campus, thus, the interaction among them continuously takes place there, and they share more time with friends in many places; school, dormitory, bedroom, mosque, canteen, or even bathroom. As a result, the more intense the acquaintance made among students leads to a more forceful and continuous contact which can bring to the higher the possibility of bullying to occur (Pfeiffer & Pinquart, 2014). These reasons make the institutions vulnerable for bullying to arise. Therefore, the modern *pesantren* have a responsibility to address the bullying issue. Teachers in the *pesantren* have a vital part in recognizing, perceiving, and preventing such behaviors. Expressing empathy, and perceiving the seriousness of bullying situations will be the steps before implementing the intervention, since “teachers’ perceptions of the situation affect their abilities or willingness to intervene” (Beebout-Bladholm, 2010, p. 9). For instance, if a teacher sees that a child is a target for jokes or chuckling, or why this particular child is the center for so many to mock, without any concern of such occurrences, it

will cause bullying to occur frequently. Beebout-Bladholm (2010) also criticized that there are teachers in school systems who believe that bullying behavior is just the children's habit. Additionally, Hazler, Miller, Carney and Green (2001) found that teachers mostly put their concern on physical harm occurrence but often underestimate the situations involving repeated psychological and social abuse among students (Coffee, 2004).

Similarly, in another study Dake, Price, and Telljohann (2003, p. 177) commented that "teachers' perceptions of bullying may influence when and how willing they are to intervene." Apparently, students and teachers show different perceptions of bullying behaviors. Based on the survey, Boulton (1997, p. 230) found that about one in four teachers did not regard "name calling, spreading nasty stories, intimidating by staring, and taking other people's belongings" as part of bullying. This situation makes teachers to ignore bullied students within the school environment. Hoover, Oliver, and Hazler (1992) described that "60 percent of victims of bullying considered the response by the school to be poor" (Bauman & Del Rio 2005, p. 430). In addition, Doll, Song, and Siemers (in Espelage & Swearer, 2004) also noted that teachers do not show an effective response when students report the bullying issue, and Batsche (in Bear, Minke & Thomas, 1997) as reported by Stephenson and Smith (1989) told that 25% of teachers think that to ignore the bullying problem was a good strategy. For this reason, many students are hesitant to report that they are being bullied due to the ineffectiveness of teachers' responses (Oliver & Candappa, 2007; Hymel & Swearer, 2015).

Another reason to select the modern *pesantren* as the object of this study is because one of the researchers was a student of the *pesantren* nine years ago. He experienced that the circumstance of the *pesantren* was austere with strict rules to discipline students. The authority of senior students to discipline their juniors has contributed to bullying occurrence in the institution. It happens frequently within the modern *pesantren* environment, as reported by Basyiruddin (2010) that two students from

pesantren Assalam, Sukoharjo, Central Java, were hospitalized due to physical bullying of their seniors in 2007. Additionally, He also witnessed many of his friends and juniors that were teased by names. Name-calling (*laqab*) occurs repeatedly among students within the *pesantren* setting, but many teachers disregard this type of bullying as a serious issue. This condition leads to the ignorance of preventing or intervening in it. Therefore, this idea triggered the authors to explore the topic of teachers' perceptions of bullying behaviors. Besides perceptions, the issue of intervention against bullying is also important to be elaborated in this study. Crothers (2008, p. 132) also commented that "intervention is critically important in preventing and reducing children's behavior problems," including bullying, since it can be influential toward students' academic achievement, social and their emotional well-being. Consequently, the study of teachers' perceptions and interventions employed against bullying at the modern *pesantren* in Aceh urgently needed to be conducted as Pfeiffer and Piquart (2014, p. 581-582) proposed that "studies of bullying in boarding schools are important, because students meet the same peers as well as the same bullies at school and in their residential setting."

1.1 Purpose and Research Questions

The aim of this study is to obtain information of how teachers at the modern *pesantren* perceive the bullying issue among students as well as to explore what kind of methods teacher employ to prevent bullying at the *pesantren*. In addition, this work is also aimed to investigate whether teachers' perceptions of the issue are in accordance with their actions to intervene or prevent it. Therefore, the research questions of this study are:

1. How do teachers at Modern Islamic Boarding School (*Pesantren*) perceive bullying behavior?
2. What kinds of intervention teachers employ at the modern *pesantren* to prevent bullying?

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Bullying Definition

Even though bullying has a variety of definitions, there are some agreements that bullying involves behavior with the intention to hurt or harm other people physically or mentally, and is repeated with the imbalance of power (Monk & Smith, 2006; Naylor, Cowie, Cossin, Bettencourt & Lemme, 2006). Additionally, Salmivalli (2009, p. 112), a Finnish psychology professor, defined that “bullying is a subtype of aggressive behavior, in which an individual or a group of individuals repeatedly attacks, humiliates, and/or excludes a relatively powerless person.” There are three main characteristics of bullying behaviors; “(a) the action occurs repeatedly over time, (b) the action is negative in nature and can take several different forms, and (c) the action involves an imbalance of social or physical power” (Elfstrom, 2007, p. 1).

Besides repetition and intention to harm, the key point of bullying behavior is the power imbalance. French and Raven (1959) employed their analysis that the power imbalance and the capacity of being a bully may derive from six bases; reward power, coercive power, expert power, referent power, legitimate power, and informational power. Specifically, reward power is when someone intentionally humiliates others to receive reward from his/her boss. Coercive power is being forced against the will. Expert power is when someone utilizes the superiority of his/her knowledge to dominate others. Referent power refers to peer group pressure. Legitimate power is the unfair force of the authorized person toward others to justify his/her position. Lastly, informational power is when someone is prevented from having access to what others have the right to receive (Rigby, 2002).

Basically, it is difficult to identify the power imbalance since it may change over time and situationally bound. Bernard Shaw (1932) illustrated that Bentley, intellectually clever but physically undeveloped, taunted his cousin through arguments. His cousin was conventionally minded but physically strong. The moment turned when Bentley's cousin was frustrated that he could not win an argument and raised his fist to intimidate his tormentor. Bentley screamed, and the family member rushed to help him and castigate the perpetrator (Rigby, 2002). The illustration portrays that the imbalance of power may be context-bound and fluid.

Repetition is another requirement to be considered as bullying behavior. As Lee (2006) stated that it is aimed to differentiate bullying from an assertive action and to highlight that the occurrence of bullying behavior not only generates direct suffering, but also the risk for future assault (Goldsmid & Howie, 2014). Intention to harm is also the criterion of the issue. But the criterion is often problematic since it comprised the subjective opinion of the offender, victim and observer (Goldsmid & Howie, 2014). On the one hand, not all academics agree on the criterion above. On the other hand, several researchers (Guerin and Hennessy, 2002) propose that a certain action which is not aimed by the perpetrator to harm, would be deliberated as bullying behavior if the victim feels hurt, and they also claimed that "an incident does not have to be repeated in order to be considered as bullying, especially if one incident causes long lasting fear of repetition" (Monk & Smith, 2006, p. 802)

Bullying has a variety of different types. The bullying behavior can be categorized direct, indirect. Physical bullying (punching & hitting), and verbal bullying (name-teasing & threatening) are considered as direct bullying behavior. While social bullying intends to ruin the victim's peer relation, and it is considered as direct or indirect bullying behavior. The direct form is whenever an individual or a group isolates a particular person from community, while indirect social bullying is gossiping toward a particular person or spreading rumors (Farrington, 1993, as cited in Monk & Smith, 2006; Donegan,

2012; Padget & Notar, 2013). Therefore, the definition of bullying in this study is the behavior which includes three main issues; intention to harm, power imbalance, and repetition.

2.1.1 Age-related Changes in Bullying Definition

Bullying is considered as a deviance behavior among children. Many researchers underlined bullying as an aggressive behavior (Yoon & Kerber, 2003; Salmivalli, 2009; Pfeiffer & Piquart, 2014). Dan Olweus, the pioneer to research on bullying behavior, published his first publication's book *Aggression in the Schools*, in 1978. The book extensively discussed bullying issue as an aggression within school environment. Younger, Schwartzman, and Ledingham (1985) tested the comprehension of assertive action by 7 to 8 years children, and discovered that they could differentiate between deviant and non-deviant attitude of their friends, but could not easily differ active from passive deviancy; aggressive action and isolation. However, as the sequence of the previous study, Younger, Schwartzman, and Ledingham (1986, p. 532) found that "the perspective of children becomes increasingly differentiated and more similar to that of adults as the age of the child evaluator increases." Assertive action and social isolation can be easier and better defined by the increasing of age.

"There is evidence for developmental differences in the ways in which pupils construe bullying" (Madsen, 1997; Smith & Levan, 1995; Smith, Madsen, & Moody, 1999, as cited in Smith, Cowie, Olafsson & Liefvooghe, 2002). They also added that younger children may not differentiate well bullying from fighting, and probably they use the bullying term to address another type of aggressive behavior, however, the power is balance. Moreover, Smith et al. (2002) conducted a research in 14 countries to address bullying definition by age differences. They found that children at 8 years old are able to contradict between aggressive and nonaggressive behavior, but they could not differ clearly the different types of assertive action (physical violence, physical bullying, verbal assault, and social

isolation). Meanwhile, the 14-year-old children can clearly distinguish the difference of those forms. Additionally, the higher number of report of being bullied which usually found in little children are probably because of the partial comprehension toward the bullying term without delineating it as only a subset of aggression. Therefore, the shallower understanding of bullying behavior by children, the higher rates of bullying and victimization report (Smith et al. 2002).

Monk and Smith (2006) also added that the age differences in the definitions of bullying given by children reflect the different occurrence of bullying experienced by younger children in comparison to older children. Many children behave aggressively to many friends within pre-school years (ages 4 to 6), therefore most of kids are unprotected to be bullied, but this situation tends to be temporary. While being the victim of bullying behavior within middle childhood and adolescence is relatively stable and long-lived. Similarly, victims are not clearly identifiable for younger children compared to older age group. It means that the victim group for children is not recognizable and no relationship of victimization between the perpetrator and victim. There will be a clear term of victimization for bullying experiences in the adolescence stage in which the experience comprises the repetitive connection between perpetrator and victim (Monk & Smith, 2006). Thus, the present research differs bullying from aggressive behavior. Bullying, as formerly described, is the behavior with three requirements; intention to harm, power imbalance, and repetition. The aggressive behavior such as fighting is not considered as bullying because it only intentionally tries to hurt others with the possibility of power imbalance, but the occurrence is not repeatedly over time.

2.2 Bullying Perception

Bullying perception has been discussed in many studies (Boulton, 1997; Hazler et al. 2001; Dake et al. 2003; Beebout-Bladholm, 2010). Those studies reported that many teachers have different views to perceive bullying. Many of them only concentrate on physical form of bullying, but ignore verbal and social form of bullying behavior within school environment. This phenomenon becomes problematic whenever teachers employ different treatment to intervene the problem. Sometimes, to measure perception is pretty complicated since it is derived from the complex brain sensory which based from the experience of seeing, hearing, and touching to the final judgement of a particular object. Styles (2005) defined perception as follows:

“The most general meaning of the term perception is sensory processing and the sense organs transduce physical energy from the outside world, which is encoded and delivered to the brain via sensory neurons for interpretation by the perceptual system. For example, the pattern of light on the retina is encoded by rods and cones; this data is transmitted through the pathways that deal with visual input and distributed to the cortical areas of the brain that are specialized for representing edges, color, shape, location, movement, etc. Perceptual analysis is refined as it moves through the visual pathways. This information can be used to judge distance, specify the spatial layout of a scene, identify faces and objects, or guide eye movements or reaching” (p. 7).

The specific definition of perception refers to experience of seeing, hearing, and touching. Commonly, we do not perceive a fragmented pattern of light or shade, but we see a face or hear a voice. In fact, we have our own conclusion to perceive a particular object such as; seeing a girl in a red car, going fast, in the distance. This is the perceptual experience that is the final output of perceptual processing (Style, 2005). Perceptually, Robinson (1994) in his book *Perception* indicated that probably everyone agrees that objects which we see sometimes look different from the way they actually are. For instance; “mountains look purple when they are not and the sky looks blue when there is nothing actually blue there; clearly defined objects look fuzzy to the short-sighted; different lights make objects look

different colors, though the objects don't actually change" (Robinson, 1994, p. 31). In considering to the common sense above, the empiricist tradition stated that:

"In some/many/most/all cases of perception, we are aware of something that possesses different sensible properties from those possessed by the physical object we take ourselves to be perceiving. That of which we are aware is, therefore, something other than the object purportedly perceived" (Robinson, 1994, p. 31).

In addition, Mohan Matthen (2005) described that the idea of common sense is principally called stimulus. The stimulus has been classified with a certain qualitative character such as; round or as red. A person as conscious subject sees a particular object with the definite recognizable stimulus, for example the ball is round or the table is square. The connection between perceiver, object, and classification become the basis interpretation for justification.

In this study, the authors consider that the teachers' interpretation in justifying their perceptions regarding bullying behavior is very dependent on their knowledge and experiences to deal with. Their existing knowledge through theoretical reading of news, journals or articles related to the issue and experiencing of seeing, hearing, or dealing with the issue as a deviant social behavior play a vital role in clarifying for justification. Then, it is known as their perceptions of bullying problem. In addition, in this research the authors are concerned with how the research can be credible, transferable, dependable, and confirmable. Therefore, the different bullying perceptions obtained from the fieldwork will be deliberated as the enrichment of a unique perspective to the study.

Alternatively, literature concerning perception comes from the perspective of the phenomenological concept. In the phenomenological concept, perception is almost similar to experience, for instance, how people experience (perceive) a particular phenomenon. "For Dewey, experience is always embodied and immediate, enjoyed or suffered, whereas knowledge is the mediated product of inquiry" (Dahlin, 2001, p. 455). Dahlin (2001) also described that both Husserl and Merleau-Ponty considered the interrelation between experience and the world where people live

and interact. According to them, human consciousness and the world equally constitute each other, and they are inseparable. Merleau-Ponty (1964, p.25) defined the experience of perception as follows:

“the experience of perception is our presence at the moment when things, truths, values are constituted for us; that perception is a nascent logos; that it teaches us, outside all dogmatism, the true conditions of objectivity itself, that it summons us to the tasks of knowledge and action” (Dahlin, 2001, p. 463).

It should be noticed that perception is an emerging *logos*. It has several meanings; knowledge, order, and structure. Subsequently, as potential knowledge, perception is deliberated as being constructed knowledge. In other words, perception is not a developed knowledge yet, but it has a particular hidden meaning (Dahlin, 2001). Therefore, phenomenologically the teachers’ perceptions of bullying behavior in this study consist of dual interpretations: their own meaning making interpretation based on the truths and values constituted and derived from their experiences, and the interpretation of the researchers after proposing critical questions toward the teachers’ answers. Consequently, based on the several theories above, the meaning of perception in this study is the individual interpretation of how a person experiences (self-lived experience or the experience toward the surrounding world) a particular phenomenon.

2.2.1 How Teachers’ Perceive Bullying Behavior

Bullying is becoming a nightmare and one of the major behavior problems within school environment around the globe (Aluede, Adeleke, Omoike, & Afen-Akpaida, 2008). “In Canada, 15 percent reported bullying others more than twice a term while 9 percent of children reported bullying others on a weekly basis” (Charach, Pepler, & Ziegler, 1995, as cited in Craig, Henderson, & Murphy, 2000, p. 6). In the United States, there are about 70 percent of all students affected by bullying (Kennedy, Russom, & Kevorkian, 2012). Therefore, teachers as the main figure in the educational processes in schools’

setting are expected to be the ones who are able to cope with bullying problem. Teachers have a vital role to reduce the issue within schools' environment. As Rabah and Vlaardingerbroekt (2005) verified in their study that teachers have a significant part in overcoming the problematic issue of bullying behavior.

Many teachers do not perceive bullying problem as a serious issue. However, their seriousness in perceiving and dealing with this issue will influence their willingness for prevention and intervention (Dake et al. 2003; Beebout-Bladholm, 2010). Pepler, Craig, Ziegler, and Charach (1994, as cited in Craig et al. 2000) reported that teachers interfered bullying almost always or considered as often. On the contrary, the teachers' interventions against bullying behavior only had been reported by 35 percent of students. Likewise, Olweus (1984) in a questionnaire study found that about 40 percent of elementary students and 60 percent of junior high students reported that teachers attempt to intervene bullying only once in a while or almost never (Craig et al. 2000). In addition, the study conducted by Unnever and Cornell (2003) showed that most of junior high students perceive that their teachers rarely try to intervene bullying (Kennedy et al. 2012). These facts portray that schools' responses through teachers' action to prevent bullying is considered to be poor.

Similarly, Batsche (in Bear, Minke, & Thomas, 1997, p. 176) reported that "the response of school personnel to bullying is, at best, disappointing, and results of research conducted at different times and in different countries provide a similar picture." In a research investigated by Stephenson and Smith (1989) they found that about 25% of teachers think that the ignorance of bullying problem is a good idea, because the occurrences of the problem are often in the form of verbal assault, withdrawal or isolation, thus, they probably perceive that these behaviors are not considered as a serious issue. Boulton and Underwood (1992) also found that the frequency of bullying intervention reported by teachers was more than the frequency reported by students. This situation shows that many teachers

pay less attention toward the bullied students. Consequently, the bullied students will perceive that the teachers are not concerned to their problem, and their teachers will be considered as not able to protect students from those aggressive behaviors (Batsche in Bear et al., 1997).

Essentially, if a teacher perceives bullying problem as a dangerous behavior which can bring long-term effect, she/he might do something to assist a child whenever she/he reports for having been bullied by others. Otherwise, if a teachers expresses little sympathy for the victim, she/he might do less to help a child who reports of being bullied by his/her friends (Boulton, 1997). Misinterpreting other behavior as bullying is also a problem to perceive bullying inaccurately (Boulton, 1997; Hazler et al., 2001). Thus, in order to perceive bullying correctly, teachers must be able to identify bullying in all its forms.

Additionally, teachers' abilities to identify bullying behaviors accurately and decide appropriate ways to interfere bullies and victims are often mystified by different definitions to assess bullying within the literature (Hazler et al., 2001). Monks and Smith (2006) also explained that usually the school staffs who define bullying behavior differently are not only teachers but also other school personnel. Moreover, Marshall et al. (2009) discussed a study conducted by Hazler et al. (2001) which they found that even teachers and school counselors have different ability to distinguish between bullying behavior and other forms of children play and violence. Furthermore, Farrell (2010) demonstrated that "a recent Australian study involving early childhood staff employed across three Brisbane childcare centers showed that staff were hesitant to label children as bullies or victims, instead opting for such terms as inappropriate or unacceptable behavior when describing negative interactions" (Goryl, Neilsen-Hewett, & Sweller, 2013, p.33). A similar model was described by Tepetas, Akgun and Altun (2010, as cited in Goryl et al., 2013, p.33) who found the preschool of Turkish teachers that they could not identify well bullying behavior and only define it as physical

attack or defiance behavior, and they did not consider psychological or verbal types of bullying. As a result, many teachers mostly put their concern only on physical harm occurrence but often underestimate the situations involving repeated psychological and social abuse among students such as; name calling and spreading rumors.

Considering the different perceptions to see and distinguish between the acts of bullying and other types of youthful play, many teachers will probably respond mistakenly toward bullying report. This dilemma will lead to the students' reluctance to report that they are being bullied. Oliver and Candappa (2007) criticized that students feel hesitant to report of bullying because of inappropriate responses obtained from their teachers. In a research conducted by Boulton and Underwood (1992), "a survey of 296 pupils aged between eight and eleven years from three middle schools, they found that only a third of respondents reported that teachers almost always try to stop bullying in school" (Oliver & Candappa, 2007, p. 72.). Thus, the fact that many teachers perceive or define bullying differently could probably be one of the factors why most of teachers may do less or intervene inaccurately toward bullying problems.

2.2.2 Teasing: An Ambiguous Bullying Form

While physical bullying is the most obvious form of bullying related to violence behavior, verbal bullying refers to the practice of teasing, name-calling, and verbal threat (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006). As part of verbal form of bullying, teasing is often considered ambiguous. Land (2003) suggested that some researchers deliberate teasing as part of bullying behavior, while some others disregard it (Boulton and Hawker, 1997; Hazler et al., 1997; Keltner et al., 1998; Ross, 1996; Olweus, 1999). She also added that many researchers consider bullying as unacceptable behavior, while teasing is acceptable, and many of them have difficulties to define teasing since its definition and description

vary widely. Nevertheless, when a survey of bullying was conducted, many students testified that they experienced teasing or name-calling as the most repeated type of bullying within school setting (Land, 2003; Smith et al., 2010).

Teasing is considered as part of human life. “People tease to socialize, flirt, resolve conflicts, and pass the time in imaginative and playful ways, and with slight variations in utterance and display, teasing can lead to more disturbing ends, as when teasing humiliates or harasses” (Keltner, Capps, Kring, Young, & Heerey, 2001, p. 229). In considering what Keltner et al. (2001) argued about teasing, it is still deliberated ambiguous since it is difficult to measure when the teasing is just a playful or humiliating. Smith et al. (2010) also said that teasing is ambiguous, and it is laborious to distinguish teasing from other forms of children’ acquaintance within school community. Many researchers reported that teachers’ perception concerning bullying behavior influence the way they recognize and interfere the issue, including the case of teasing (Boulton, 1997; Craig et al., 2000).

According to the study conducted by Keltner et al. (2001, p. 232), “almost all investigators agree that teasing involves aggression”. Teasing potentially leads to an undesirable social contact among students. Several researchers perceive teasing as a harmful behavior which is considered as part of bullying (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006). Smith et al. (2010) proposed that teasing is possible to be positive within children’s interaction whenever it is followed by some particular qualities such as; friendly tone of voice, humor, and positive communication (fun and playful). Moreover, teasing is becoming an anti-social behavior whenever it refers to name-calling, verbal harassment or taunting. Teasing can be a prosocial behavior whenever it is a friendly and playful interaction to do mockery and does not affect the victim to be humiliated (Smith et al., 2010).

Smith et al. (2010) also commented that there are only a few studies examining teachers’ perceptions and their dealings toward teasing within school environment. The initial study of teasing

was conducted by Shapiro, Baumeister, and Kessler (1991). They stated that about 94% of teachers teaching in the third, fifth, and eighth grade claimed that teasing can be positive or negative within students' interaction. In a survey investigated by Holt and Keyes (2004, as cited in Smith et al., 2010), there are about 73% percent teachers noticed teasing as a negative behavior. While some other research have reported that most of teachers do not perceive teasing as a problematic issue which can harm student relations (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006). Therefore, to judge teasing whether as a harmful behavior or not is still debatable since many of the previous studies show that teasing is ambiguous to define.

2.3 *Pesantren and Bullying Issue*

Pesantren is in equivalent to boarding school in some circumstances. As described by Bass (2014, p. 17), boarding school is “a controlled residential educational program in which students are assigned to structured educational, social, and physical activities from morning until the end of the day.” Additionally, Kahane (1988) outlined that boarding schools is the institution with a live-in student population. The activities in boarding school include activities formal schooling, meal time, study time, sport, club, extracurricular activity, and social time with friends at dormitory. Essentially, these characteristics are similar to *pesantren*. What differ boarding school in general from *pesantren* is only the additional content of Islamic studies which become the main scenario within the institution.

Furthermore, *pesantren* as an educational institution in Indonesia does not only indicate an Islamic boarding school, as translated into English, but also shows some unique attributes and culture such as the way people interact within *pesantren* environment. The strong religious values are also aimed to internalize well to the people living in *pesantren*. A term *ustadz* is used to identify someone teaching in *pesantren*. The word ‘teacher’ cannot sufficiently represent the essence of what the word *ustadz* implies. Besides teaching, *Ustadz* is expected to be a role model in educating pupils by owning

good Islamic moral not only in *pesantren*, but also outside the institution. While, the term *santri* is used to indicate a person learning in *pesantren*. She/he is characterized by the full obedience and respect to *ustadz* who teaches him/her. *Santri* is also recognized by having a simple life, pious and owning a strong commitment to Islam (Raihani, 2001).

Srimulyani (2007) proposed that *pesantren* environment have two categories of *santri*; non-live-in student (*santri kalong*) and live-in student (*santri mukim*). *Santri kalong* commonly study in *salafi* (traditional) *pesantren*, while *santri mukim* are in *khalafi* (modern) *pesantren*. As *santri* in the modern *pesantren* spend 24 hours to live in the campus, therefore, the interaction among students takes place continuously. *Santri* in the modern *pesantren* share more time with their friends in many places; school, dormitory, bedroom, mosque, canteen, or even bathroom. The more intense the acquaintance made among students leads to a more forceful and continuous contact which can bring to the higher the possibility of bullying to occur (Pfeiffer & Pinquart, 2014). Similarly, Pfeiffer, Pinquart, and Krick (2016) described that as students in boarding school share more time with their peers in many occasions, this condition is positively able to promote the development of friendships and peer-group membership among them. But, the circumstance negatively increases the possibility for bullying occurrence within the environment. As the students spend their times 24 hours to live in together within the campus, the bullying problem is vulnerable to befall (Pfeiffer & Pinquart, 2014). Moreover, they also proposed that the research concerning bullying behavior within boarding schools' environment is crucial to be conducted because they found that the quantity of bullying problem within boarding school environment is higher than non-boarding school. These reasons elicit the authors' willingness to conduct a research concentrating on the study of bullying in the modern *pesantren* settings. There are many pieces of research investigating about the *pesantren*, but they mostly focus on educational and socio-cultural aspects (Raihani, 2001; Pohl, 2006; Srimulyani, 2007; Nilan, 2009;

Hady, 2012; Raihani, 2012; Vignato, 2012). Only a few studies concern on bullying behavior within the *pesantren* environment (Basyiruddin, 2010; Sahruli, 2014; Rahmawati, 2016). Therefore, it is necessary to conduct such study in order to get a clearer picture to explore students' lives with the bullying issue at the *pesantren*.

Another reason initiating the authors in investigating the issue of bullying at the *pesantren* is reflected from a research conducted by Francia and Edling (2016). The research examined the *Children's rights and violence: A case analysis at a Swedish boarding school*. Their study found two different discourses concerning bullying at boarding schools for the Swedish elite. First, bullying is the product of certain problematic individual or group toward a particular person. Second, bullying is the result of a social environment where norms and values are communicated via everyday activities such as; speeches, gestures, and body language. Furthermore, based on their interviews toward the victims of bullying at Lundsberg School (a Swedish boarding school), they found as follows:

“The school was described as a closed family that students need to become part of for their existence. These descriptions declare that in order to be accepted by ‘the school family’ of Lundsberg, younger students must take part in initiation rituals called ‘proof of existence’. Students who refuse to become objects or take part in these ‘proofs of existence’ risked being excluded from ‘the school family’” (Francia & Edling, 2016, p. 9)

The idea above reveals two sides, positive and negative. A school culture with the value of being family will be positive as long as the school's members agree to commit on positive behavior and firmly deny bullying within the community. Otherwise, it will turn to be negative if many people in the environment keep considering negative behavior (e.g. bullying) as an ordinary issue due to the fear of being isolated from a group's membership. In the *pesantren* context, many students keep bullying their peers as part of solidarity to a particular membership. For example, a group of senior students bully their juniors for the sake of proving their existence as seniors. Two *santri* from *pesantren* Assalam,

Sukoharjo, Central Java, were hospitalized due to physical bullying of their seniors in 2007 (Basyiruddin, 2010). Rahmawati (2016) also reported that four in ten students of *pesantren* Assanusi, Cirebon, were also bullied by their senior peers. Some of them were teased, punched, and isolated. These facts portray that the intensity of interaction and the cultural values within the *pesantren* environment make the bullying problem vulnerable to occur and is crucial to be investigated.

2.4 The Effect of Bullying

Considering the harmfulness of bullying behavior, the issue of the bullying effect is important to discuss and elaborate in this review of literature as the standpoint of why bullying problem needs to intervened or prevented.

Essentially, bullying can have a damaging effect on a person being bullied. For instance, a victim of bullying will be scare of being humiliated, teased, or harassed by his/her peers whenever she/he goes to school. The impact of bullying behavior within school environment is quite shocking. It causes many negative effects physically, psychologically, and socially. Flaspohler, Elfstrom, Vanderzee, Sink, and Birchmeier (2009, p. 636) proposed that “bullying is one of the most common forms of youth violence; it has been linked to a host of negative consequences for children’s health and mental health.” Dake et al. (2003) showed that in a study of 3.000 victimized students from London, most of them suffer from physical health symptoms; sleeping problem, bed wetting, headaches, and stomachache. William, Chambers, Logan, and Robinson (1996) also found that the British children who were bullied by their peers within school environment two times more likely to feel headache and stomachache than non-victimized children (Nishina, Juvonen, & Witkow, 2005). The study of Australian high school students also discovered that the victimized males and females students suffered

poorer physical wellbeing. According to Kerlikowske (2003, as cited in Aluede et al., 2008, p. 156), he noticed that:

“Children who are bullied are more likely to be depressed; 26% of girl students who were frequently bullied reported depression as opposed to 8% of girls who were not. Similarly the boys who were bullied and reported depression were 16% as against 3% who were not”.

Additionally, Snyder et al. (2003) in a study involving 266 male and female students remarked that the harassed students tend to be more unsociable and miserable than non-harassed children. Aluede et al. (2008) in a research conducted by Clarke and Kiselica (1997) added that psychologically, the traumatic of being bullied endures for many years, and the feeling of being isolated seems to end into adulthood. Anxiety is another type of psychological symptom to be suffered by victimized children. The bullied students are three to four times more likely to feel anxiety to non-bullied students (Dake et al., 2003). Moreover, Nishina et al. (2005) examined self-reports of 6th graders students concerning the feeling of being bullied by their friends. They found that female students reported more social anxiety than males; however, male students testified significantly higher levels of being victimized than females. Additionally, Flaspohler et al. (2009) reported the findings from their study that children not involving in bullying circle tend to have better life quality and satisfaction, and they are likely experience to have more supportive atmosphere from their teachers and friends than students who are the target of bullying.

Besides victim, bullying behavior also gives a negative impact for a bully (Woods & White 2005, as cited in Van Rensburg & Raubenheimer, 2014). A bully student is also predicted to suffer from depression, anti-social personality disorder, and aggression in the future of adulthood (Sourander et al. 2007). This was also supported in a study by Renda, Vassalo, and Edwards (2011). They investigated bullying behavior in initial age of teens and its relationship to unsociable behavior,

lawbreaking and aggression within the next 6 and 10 years. They found that that being a bully will result to possess anti-social behavior and the possibility to engage with the criminality.

2.5 Why People Bully: The Theoretical Perspectives

Many studies have highlighted the issue of bullying in schools, but only a little research has paid attention to the teachers' perception of bullying behavior. However, teachers are essentially the key figure in reducing and preventing the bullying issue within school environment (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006). Essentially, teachers have a vital responsibility to manage and prevent the bullying problem. According to James et al. (2008, as cited in Fontes, 2014), teachers' role are significantly crucial to manage and prevent the problem of bullying. Although many anti-bullying programs have been proposed to be applied such as using a whole school approach, they tend to put the concern only on students' conducts and infrequently investigate the description of other bonds which exist within school settings.

2.5.1 Social Influence

Social psychology is interested to examine why people sometimes act in a prosocial behavior such as; helping, liking, or loving others, but at other times they appear to show antisocial behaviors: hostility, aggression, or prejudice against others (Gini, 2000). As bullying is linked to an aggressive behavior, she analyzed that "the empirical confirmation of the crucial role of peer ecology in the bullying phenomenon derives from several observational studies conducted while children freely interact in unstructured context, such as during recess and in outdoor play" (Gini, 2006, p. 52). Additionally, Tajfel and Turner (1979, as cited in Gini, 2006) suggested a social identity theory. The theory offers

that an individual belief and perception toward in group and out group elements consequently originate from their willingness to recognize that his/her group as being better or superior comparing to other groups. The result of this process will direct a particular person to show his/her favoritism to in-group members. On the other hand, the person will discriminate out-group members since he/she perceives that the out-group members as being different from his/hers. The bullying problem is also derived from this phenomenon. A bully perceives a victim as someone who is different from his/her group, thus, to prove the existence or the superiority of the group she/he will bully others.

Furthermore, Fox and Boulton (2005) described that psychologists and researchers have used the term 'social skills' to portray a capacity of a person to socialize. Socially skilled refers to the ability to develop and make a friend easily, and also resolve difficult social problems judiciously. In contrast, if someone has a difficulty in managing this skill in his/her life, she/he will face many adversities to socialize well within an environment. Parault, Davis, and Pellegrini (2007) stressed the viewpoint of Coie (1990) who stated that children's social behaviors, and their social skill will determine the victimization. Social skill or competence is not only the ability of how to socialize well with the social context, but also the capability to manage emotional and cognitive skill for the adaptation. For instance, Fox and Boulton (2005) in a study by Elliott (1991) reported that victims of bullying are commonly lack of qualities of the social skill. The victims are mostly lack of sense of humor, and have a serious manner a within the school life. Specifically for the school life or school environment, it refers to the characteristics or features of a school itself such as; school rules, objectives, ethics, social relationships, teaching learning process, leadership practices, and school structures (National School Climate Council, 2007, as cited in Espelage, Polanin, & Low, 2014). Therefore, teachers and other staff's perceptions of the environment are strongly correlated to students' behaviors, including bullying.

If in a specific school atmosphere the teachers and staffs perceive bullying as non-dangerous behavior, the problem will endure for years since they will not try to prevent it. Otherwise, if they belief the issue as a harmful behavior, they will try to intervene and tackle the problem.

Moreover, Harcourt, Jasperse, and Green (2014) in the study of Repo (2015) suggested that socio-cultural theory is also another theory which can describe of why bullying occurs. The theory explains that bullying as a complex social phenomena affected by many social variables within a child such as; school, home, peer, and community environments. Even a very young child is profoundly surrounded by a complex social environment with a continuous interaction and communication of the actor and the environment. Essentially, bullying is significantly needed to be perceived in the context and the culture of the organization where it originates. This theory also offers to see bullying as a behavior connected to the community.

Two other theories which can be used to address why people bully are routine activity and social bond theory as proposed by Cecen-Celik and Keith (2016) in their study. Cohen and Felson (1979) stated that according to routine activity theory, crime tends to happen when a suitable target comes into contact with a motivated perpetrator with the absence of qualified guardians. A suitable target refers to someone that triggers the willingness of the perpetrator to do crime, while a capable guardian is someone who is able to prevent from the crime's occurrence. In school context, the occurrence of bullying can be drawn from the presence of suitable target, motivated perpetrator, and the absence of the capable guardian such as; school principal, teacher or school staff. For instance, when a suitable target is in contact with a motivated offender in a particular activity within a school area, the bullying action of the motivated perpetrator toward the target can be prevented by the presence of a teacher in the activity (Cecen-Celik & Keith, 2016).

In addition, they also suggested the social bond theory to identify the cause of victimization. Hirschi (1969) stressed that how strong bonds with conventional society will prevent somebody to commit crime. Although this theory is usually used to understand what causes crime, the theory can also be used to indicate the cause of bullying problem (Higgins, Khey, Dawson-Edwards, & Marcum, 2012, as cited in Cecen-Celik & Keith, 2016). Basically, the theory offers that the stronger the acquaintances with others the lower the possibility to be bullied. Therefore, by keeping well the friendship, it will prevent the likelihood of bullying. Consequently, based on social bond theory, building a close and positive relationship among students will be beneficial to strengthen their attachments in school life and reduce their involvement in bullying (Cecen-Celik & Keith, 2016).

2.5.2 Social Cognitive Learning and Modeling

People are able to learn by seeing and observing others in social context within a particular environment (Bandura, 2001). It means that people do not learn new attitudes or behaviors exclusively by trying, but many people replicate the action of others. It also depends whether a specific action is rewarded or punished to do it, the action may be modeled by other people. For instance, each behavior observed and witnessed can change a person's way of thinking (cognition). Likewise, an environment has a big contribution to influence the later behaviors of children, as a family's way of thinking (cognition) will strongly shape the environment in which children are raised (Bandura, 2001).

In a study by Repo (2015), Bandura (1977) described about the social learning theory which stressed the impact of family variables has a significant contribution for bullying behavior to befall. The violent experience of a child within family setting will significantly influence to the involvement of bullying behavior. In other words, individuals may learn bullying behaviors through observation, and role-modeling. Fontes (2014) portrayed on what Bandura (2001) did in his study to examine that

children learn through observation to replicate. Bandura conducted an experiment entitled *Bobo Doll Behavior: A Study of Aggression* (Bandura, 2001). In the experimentation, Bandura presented a cluster of students to a movie of violence and assertive action. After displaying the movie, the students are asked to enter to a room with a Bobo doll to observe the way they behave with it. Bandura found that the students watching the movie played more aggressive toward the doll. This experiment portrays that the social cognitive theory depicts how people recreate behaviors they see. Therefore, a child who is raised in homes with family members which often see or witness the domestic violence is vulnerable to involve in bullying behavior in his/her future.

2.5.3 Socio-ecological Theory

Espelage and Swearer (2004) argued that the occurrence of bullying is not in isolation, but bullying behavior is as a result of the complex relationships among many integrated systems such as; individual, family, peer group, school, community, and culture. This idea was proposed by Bronfenbrenner (1979) in his theory, 'Socio-ecological Theory'. Atlas and Pepper (1998) stated that in ecological view, it conceptualizes that the bullying behavior is caused by the interaction within the social ecological context (Yoon, 2004). Individual is the center of his or her social ecology, but an individual generates an active connection to her or his school, peer group, family and cultural context where she or he lives. This circle of relation contributes for bullying to arise. Similarly, Bronfenbrenner (1979 as cited in Espelage & Swearer 2004) suggested that ecological-systems theory is a theory in which individuals are part of interrelated interaction to influence human behavior, including bullying. According to Urie Bronfenbrenner, an individual is an inseparable element of a social system consisted of four interconnected systems; microsystem, mesosystem, *exosystem*, and *macrosystem*.

Microsystem comprises a child's association to a particular system such as; home or school. In microsystem, the child has a direct connection to others, including the reaction of being exposed to bullying issue. The direct interaction of a child to bullying behavior in his or her social circumstance would worsen the victimization. Subsequently, the mesosystem incorporates the interconnection of a child life's system (e.g., home and school). The mesosystem portrays the equivalent of two or more circumstances, such as the equivalent between residential setting and school concerning bullying issue. The *exosystem* involves the impact from other context, such as the influence of an anti-bullying policy or parental involvement within school structure. Lastly, the *macrosystem* is the impact of cultural background which involves the public standpoints toward bullying issue (Espelage & Swearer, 2004)

Besides those four systems, Espelage (2014) mentioned another part of ecological framework proposed by Bronfenbrenner, the chronosystem level. It includes the consistency or change of the individual and the environment surrounding him/her over the life such as the historical of life experience. Breivik and Olweus (2006, as cited in Espelage, 2014) described that many studies have shown that changes in life experiences will lead to negative youth outcomes such as aggression or violence. Ashiabi and O'Neal (2015) also suggested that children are heavily dependent on their parents' life, therefore, family aspect tends to have a greater influence on children developmental results. For example, the divorced family will result a child with higher possibility to be aggressive. In addition, Fontes (2014) in a study conducted by Lee (2011) stated that based on an ecological systems theory, the significant aspect affecting bullying in a child life is at the level of middle and high school. These levels consist of those five discussed systems. Particularly, the ecological factors includes personal qualities, family experiences, parental involvement, school climate, and community features.

As bullying occurs commonly in classroom within school environment, thus, the discussion on the classroom ecosystem is also important to be elaborated in this section (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz,

Bjorkqvist, Osterman, & Kaukiainen, 1996, as cited in Espelage & Swearer, 2004). One of the main factors of classrooms' ecosystems that need to be comprehended well is the quality of societal attitudes and connections within a classroom setting comprising the relation among students, between students and teachers, and also between families and classroom (Espelage & Swearer, 2004). Peer relationship is deliberated as one of the most important aspect in bullying occurrence within a classroom context. Aggressive behaviors are commonly found among students interaction. For instance, rough and tumble play which verbally and physically aggressive are easily to befall within classroom's interaction. The play is not considered as bullying if it is not intended to cause harm, but whenever it is aimed to inflict harm, it is bullying (Espelage & Swearer, 2004). Moreover, Sekol (2016) also commented that students and teachers relationship have also been researched in many studies of bullying behavior. The study on teacher-student relationship related to bullying behavior is also a crucial issue since teachers sometimes act negatively toward a particular student and give an excuse for others to bully that students, or teachers may encourage bullying by showing his/her favoritism toward a bully student in a classroom. This situation will cause bullying to endure for years. Furthermore, family is also an interrelated factor to bullying behavior in classroom. As discussed earlier, a student with the background of violence in his/her family tends to have the higher possibility to involve in bullying within classroom environment.

2.6 The Bullying Intervention

As previously discussed in this chapter, teachers' interventions toward bullying behavior are heavily dependent on their perceptions of the issue. Many teachers do not involve efficiently in intervening bullying due to the difference perceptions of bullying definition. Based on a study by Clarke and Kiselica (1997), they showed that teachers do not respond appropriately to many bullying report within

school area. Their study portrayed that about 33.6% students in England answered ‘sometimes’ or ‘almost never’ toward the frequency of teachers’ intervention on bullying behavior (Bauman & Hurley, 2005). Additionally, in a study conducted by Bauman and Hurley (2005) they discovered that the majority of teachers (88%) perceived themselves to intervene well the bullying episode in school, while only 20% of students believed that teachers have a sufficient supervision toward bullying behavior. This findings reveal that the willingness of teachers in preventing and intervening bullying within school environment is lower than they perceive they are.

The investigation on bullying intervention have been examined and elaborated in many studies. Mann, Kristjansson, Sigfusdottir, and Smith (2015) proposed that the efforts to intervene bullying can be classified by stressing an individual quality, educational institution, or other external aspects such as society or family qualities. Bullying on the individual-focused intervention is seen as personal effect or outcome. The concrete step of the individual-focused intervention is to identify properly a susceptible child or student to involve in bullying behavior and find him/her an effective counseling to tackle the problem. In educational institution-focused intervention, bullying is a school product (e.g. school culture or school climate). In this type of intervention, school personnel and administrator try to concentrate on creating school’s climate as the safest place against the bullying behavior. Moreover, in society or family-focused intervention, bullying is believed as the result of family and community interaction. This sort of intervention focuses on encouraging of how family and community members synergize to develop a social support network by having good communication each other to prevent children in a particular family of community to do bullying (Mann et al., 2015).

KiVa is another bullying intervention program which has been tested and developed in Finland. Salmivalli et al. (2010, as cited in Williford, 2012) described that KiVa program perceives bullying as a group process in which the bully acts assertively for obtaining higher peer-group status, and the

behavior is repeatedly supported by the ignorance of bystanders. Additionally, the program is designed to reinforce students' involvement to prevent bullying among their peers and also to defend victims from bullies. Basically, the KiVa program emphasizes on enhancing bystanders' abilities to support victimized friends. A recent study by Jeffrey (2004) reported that peers present in 85% of bullying occurrence, but they intervened in only 10% episodes. Therefore, to reinforce bystander reaction is another crucial issue to prevent bullying problem (Padget & Notar, 2013). However, how bystanders behave depends on their status: (a) outsiders is someone not involving in bullying experiences among their schoolmates; (b) defenders, who tends to help the victims in bullying occurrences; (c) guilty bystanders, who did nothing to help the victims but felt guilty about it; and (d) unconcerned bystanders, who saw the victimized friends without feeling responsible to help or do something (Padget & Notar, 2013). Therefore, implementing KiVa program by reinforcing peer involvement in bullying episode to act as defender bystander is significantly important to reduce bullying within school environment, because the study by Williford et al. (2012) affirmed that the implementation of the program was able to downgrade the problem effectively.

The final model of bullying intervention discussed in this chapter is the whole school approach model. The program is known as *Olweus Bullying Prevention Program* (Cecil & Molnar-Main, 2014). It was developed by Dan Olweus, the pioneer of research in bullying field. Ecologically, the whole-school approach considers all levels of the environment in the context of the relationship to school. It offers the prevention and intervention approaches with a variability of level of school ecology. At the school context, all school personnel and students are trained equally to obtain the substantial information regarding bullying behavior and the strategy to respond it. School policy is also needed to address appropriate intervention and consequences for bullying occurrence. At the classroom level, teachers must be able to hold a weekly classroom meetings and instructional curricula regarding the

issue. Students must be trained well toward bullying situation by using pro-social behaviors (Olweus, 1993; Smith, Schneider et al., 2004, as cited in Losey, 2009).

2.6.1 The Approaches Employed to intervene bullying

Rigby (2014) in his study compared five reactive approaches which have been employed in schools around the globe to intervene bullying behavior; direct sanction, restorative practice, mediation, the support group method and the method of shared concern.

Direct sanctions refers to negative outcomes of students who are identified as being responsible to bully others. This type of intervention has been used widely in England, and the sanctions incorporate verbal warning, parents' meeting, classroom withdrawal, alienation of privilege, and preventing from school extracurricular activities (Thompson & Smith, 2011, as cited in Rigby, 2014). The idea of this strategy is that the bullies are worth to be penalized, and the punishments become the prevention to further bullying behaviors. Unfortunately, the strategy does not encourage productive relationship for students involving in the bullying or even teachers who implement the sanction. If the bullying stops, the perpetrators only afraid of the sanction (Rigby, 2014).

In Restorative Practice, those students identified as bullies are asked to join a meeting with the presence of a victim as well. The bullies are asked to pay attention to the victim's explanation of what has happened, and how the victim was treated by the bullies. The bullies are expected to do reflection of why they did bullying. The purpose is to educate the bullies' consciousness toward the harmful action which they have affected to the victim. The bullies are also questioned of what steps need to be done in the future. It is hoped that the bullies will resolve the problem and ask an apology from the victim as well. This method allows the intensity of creative engagement to those students involved in

bullying behavior. Teachers are also able to see comprehensively what was going on between bully and victim (Rigby, 2014).

In Mediation approach, students engaging in bullying behavior are encouraged to attend a meeting with a mediator. The mediator invites those students to tell the story of bullying occurrence in turn without interrupting one to another. Then, every student is expected to propose potential solution to solve the conflict. Notably, the proposed resolutions are made by the involved students. This step shows that the students involve in the process of creating an equally satisfactory result. This strategy produces a high level of productive relationship between the bullies and victim to deal with the established solution of the problem (Rigby, 2014).

The support group method is appropriate to moderate bullying cases in which a particular group of students bully others. The method begins by interviewing a victim. The main purpose is to offer the victim a supportive atmosphere in order to obtain a truthful description of what has happened. The strategy guarantees that there will be punishment for nobody. Subsequently, the victim is questioned the name of bullies. Later, a teacher who applies the method will hold meeting with the bullies and several other students who are expected to stand on the victim's side. The meeting is held without the presence of the victim. At the meeting, the teacher tells about the victim's suffering experience and emphasizes that those attend the meeting should think on how to recover the condition. Everyone is asked to declare of what they will do for helping the victim. They are also informed that there will be another meeting in the near future to evaluate the progress. The teacher also fosters them to discuss about what they will assist to recover the situation (Rigby, 2014).

Like the support group method, the method of shared concern is a non-punitive strategy to intervene students who are suspected as perpetrators. It starts with one by one interviews with all the suspected individuals of those engaging in bullying behavior. The aim of this strategy is to obtain the

appropriate responses from the bullies concerning a traumatic bullied child. The bullies are also asked of how to recover the condition. This approach is not similar to the previous method. In one-to-one interview, the interaction can be more intimate, and it turns to be possible to individualize participants of the group and provides in depth engagement between teacher and bully in order to improve the circumstance after what have occurred (Rigby, 2014).

Besides those reactive approaches employed, using proactive or preventive strategies by creating or controlling the situation is also virtuous than only solving the problem in short-term period. (Rigby, 2014). As one of the school issues, bullying also needs a school policy to operationalize its position within school life. This would be a whole-school response to bullying behavior. The policy continues from reactive strategy in which teachers respond the problem after its occurrence to the proactive way by anticipating the critical times when bullying is more likely to befall. The preventive or proactive approach must be declared firmly that bullying is contrary to school values and ethos. Building a school environment and school culture which make students feel safe without having anxiety feeling of being bullied by other can actually reduce the number of bullying incidents. As discussed previously, the whole-school approach is one of the preventive strategies which has been offered by Dan Olweus, the initial researcher in the field of bullying. It offers the intervention within the hierarchy of school context from the school policy to classroom level in which students are trained to respond the bullying by using pro-social behaviors. Using this type of proactive approach can be applied effectively to decrease the occurrence of bullying behavior in school environment (Tattums, 1997).

3 METHODOLOGY

The following research is aimed to discover the teachers' perceptions and their interventions toward bullying behavior at Aceh Modern Islamic Boarding Schools (*Pesantren*). Besides obtaining insight on teachers' perceptions and their strategy to intervene the bullying issue within the institution, the study is also intended to investigate whether their perceptions of bullying behavior are in accordance with their actions to intervene or prevent it.

3.1 *Research Design*

As a qualitative research, the procedure of this study used participant observation and in-depth interview to explore teachers' perceptions and their interventions toward bullying issue at the modern *pesantren* in Aceh. Participant observation was conducted by both observing and participating in daily and regular activities which were relevant to the purpose of this study. Doing informal conversation and interaction with members of the study were also conducted to gain meaningful information. Additionally, the in-depth interviews were first handed to informants with a consent letter stating that the participation was voluntarily, that the information will be anonymous, and that they were free to decline to answer any questions they did not wish to.

Furthermore, considering the heterogeneity of the people, there are five cities (Banda Aceh, Sabang, Lhokseumawe, Langsa and Subulussalam) within Aceh province, Indonesia, excluding the eighteen-regency. From the five-city, the statistics survey in 2014 showed that Lhokseumawe and Banda Aceh have the highest numbers of the modern *pesantren* (37 and 26) with the highest number of

santri (students studying in the *pesantren*) as well (5.894 and 4.190) (Statistics of Aceh Province, 2016). Therefore, the researchers selected one modern *pesantren* for each municipality as the object of this study.

The two selected modern *pesantren* were chosen as the object of this research because each *pesantren* has its own unique characteristics. The modern *pesantren* in Banda Aceh has a thousand students coming from the entire Aceh province with the different background of families, local languages, and cultures. This diversity combined with the continuous interaction among students within the *pesantren* environment has a big possibility for bullying to occur. While, the modern *pesantren* in Lhokseumawe is located in the former area of the armed conflict between the Movement for a Free Aceh (Gerakan Aceh Merdeka, GAM) and National Army of Indonesia (Tentara Nasional Indonesia, TNI). Most of students are coming from the former GAM combatants' family. The students' experiences of being exposed to conflict in the past have the possibility as well to trigger the bullying occurrences.

3.1.1 Qualitative Research

Sandelowski (2000) described that qualitative study is a systematic subjective approach used to explain the experiences of life and give them meaning as well as to obtain the depth, richness, and the complexity of the insight within a phenomenon (Fontes, 2014). Fossey, Harvey, McDermott, and Davidson (2002) suggested that qualitative study should concentrate on the interpretation of subjective meaning, and description of social context toward a particular phenomenon. They also proposed that qualitative research questions mainly concentrate on three aspects: language as a means to explore the communication processes and models of interaction within particular social groups; the attribution toward a specific situation and action is described or interpreted subjectively; and constructing theory

through discovering patterns and connections within qualitative data. In qualitative study, the questions are designed broadly rather than testing a specific hypothesis. The questions also reveal the intention in order to gain the deepness of comprehension toward a phenomenon. Additionally, Parylo (2012) expressed that in qualitative research, the deeper meaning is constructed socially, thus, there are multiple truths to be found. Moreover, in a study conducted by Creswell (2003), Parylo (2012) also described that the data collection of qualitative study can be obtained through interviews, observations, and field notes which are coded, analyzed, and interpreted based on the context in which a researcher intends to discover.

In qualitative research, there is no fixed minimum number of participants to set as what quantitative does. As Baker and Edwards (2012, p. 5) in *National Centre for Research Methods Review Paper* argued that “qualitative research is exploratory by nature, qualitative researchers may not know how much data to gather in advance”. Adler and Adler the two prominent lecturers of qualitative study in the university of Colorado and Denver in Baker and Edwards (2012) also verified that the researchers in qualitative study work to discover a particular phenomenon and construct the theoretical discovery in unpredicted circumstances. Therefore, the researchers will not know the exact number of data that they should collect.

Additionally, Fossey et al. (2002) suggested that the key considerations in qualitative study are appropriateness and adequacy. It means that the sampling in qualitative research needs the recognition of proper informants who can best inform on the need of a research. It also needs adequate information sources such as; people, places, or events to acquire an extensive explanation of the investigated phenomenon. They also described that the qualitative research may only involve a small numbers of informants, but the data collected can be large with many hours of informant interviews, written documents, and field notes observation. Essentially, there is no fixed minimum number of participant

that must be set in qualitative study, however, the substance is to obtain sufficient depth of information to describe comprehensively the studied phenomena.

In the present study, the data collection was conducted during the August to October 2016. In the middle of August 2016, the researchers went to the office of the Ministry of Religious Affair in Lhokseumawe to obtain the research permit letter to do the research in one of the modern *pesantren* there. After gaining the letter, on the next day we went to the targeted *pesantren* to meet the *pesantren* director to tell him about the intention of doing the research in his *pesantren*. Subsequently, we did preliminary observation to establish the criteria needed for interviewing the teachers concerning their perceptions and interventions of the bullying problem. The similar step we did as well in gathering the data from the modern *pesantren* in Banda in the early of October 2016.

In addition, as the research method employed in this study was in-depth interview, thus, the researchers selected the appropriate teacher participants who can best enlighten the need of the study. The researchers established two requirements; first, the teacher participants are in charge as dormitory teachers; second, they must fulfill at least three years' experience of being dormitory teachers. After conducting informal conversation with some teachers in both *pesantren*, we found that there were seven teachers from the *pesantren* in Lhokseumawe and eight teachers from the *pesantren* in Banda Aceh who met the criteria of the research. But, after conducting ten interviews with ten teacher participants from the two *pesantren*; five informants from the *pesantren* in Banda Aceh and five others from the *pesantren* in Lhokseumawe, we decided for not continuing the interview to the next informant because the saturation was reached. The researchers reached the points and no additional data could be found to develop, therefore, the researcher began to round the analysis.

3.1.2 The In-depth Interview

Boyce and Neale (2006) described that the in-depth interview is one of qualitative study techniques aimed to do thorough personal interview with a small quantity of informants to study and investigate their perspectives on a particular idea, program, and situation. Mack, Woodsong, MacQueen, Guest, and Namey (2005) in *Qualitative Research Methods* also justified that the in-depth interview is a procedure in a qualitative research designed to obtain a clear picture of the participants' opinion toward the researched topic.

In this study, the researchers employed semi-structured, in-depth interviews where the broad topic of bullying was discussed to develop ideas about the issue, and the researchers used prompts to probe in order to keep the conversation covering the broad areas of the issue of bullying within the *pesantren* environment. The researchers tried to engage well with the informants in order to build a mutual exchange of information concerning the researched issue. Kvale (2001, p. 1, as cited in Niska, 2014) described that “knowledge is created in the interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee”. During the interview, the informants were not expected to give a right answer, but they were encouraged to express their own opinions toward the perception of bullying and the intervention steps that they have been employing within the *pesantren* environment.

Considering the formerly defined research questions, the two predominant interview themes are the ideas of teachers' perceptions concerning bullying behavior at the *pesantren* and their interventions toward the issue. The list of interview questions covering these two central themes are composed in a very general manner in order to allow for the different perspectives and experiences to surface in the interview. Also, the phrasing of questions that were planned beforehand were often changed and adapted during the interviews in response to interview dynamics.

As previously mentioned, the interviews and data collection were conducted in two different municipalities in Aceh (Lhokseumawe and Banda Aceh). Ten teachers of the selected *pesantren* from both regions were asked to voluntarily participate in the study. Considering the ethics, the consent letter was distributed and signed before performing the interviews. All of the participants are dormitory teachers. They were chosen as the participants in this research because their main responsibilities are supervising students' interaction and preventing harmful behaviors from occurring among their students, including bullying. The interviewers invited the teachers one by one to discuss their perceptions of bullying behavior and their interventions employed toward the behavior. The teachers proved to be willing to talk and discuss the researched topic and hardly any declined. To comfort the informants in the interview, the interviewers sometimes communicated in Bahasa and Acehese language. The interview model was first tested on one of the teachers who did not take part in the study itself. All interviews were recorded and later transcribed, categorized and analyzed as unified data. The length of the interviews varied: the longest was 45 minutes, and the shortest was 25 minutes (the average length was 30 minutes).

In addition, in order to triangulate and confirm the obtained data from teacher interviews, the researchers also interviewed some students in each *pesantren* (three students from the *pesantren* in Lhokseumawe and four students from the *pesantren* in Banda Aceh). Those seven students were selected based on the criterion that the student participants had to be the victimized students within the *pesantren* environment. The researchers asked for help from the teachers from both *pesantren* to identify the victimized students. The teachers from the *pesantren* in Lhokseumawe suggested six victimized students, while the teachers from the *pesantren* in Banda Aceh proposed seven victimized students. After conducting the interviews with three students from the *pesantren* in Lhokseumawe and

four students from the *pesantren* in Banda Aceh, the researchers decided against continuing the interview because the saturation was reached.

In the interview process, the student participants were asked to participate voluntarily in this research. The interviewers tried to confirm whether teachers' perceptions and interventions toward the bullying issue in the *pesantren* are in accordance with what students perceive of their teachers. Finally, after the interviewers had recorded all the interview data, the researchers transcribed it into written verbatim form. This means that all of the informants' answers were carefully read and codified into themes which would help the researchers to analyze the data. The categories and codes were divided into:

- a. Types of bullying; physical bullying (JP), verbal bullying (JV), social bullying (JS).
- b. The background of bullying; school policy (LP), school culture (LC).
- c. Bullying forms; hitting/punching (BP), insulting/teasing (BM), threatening (BA), name-calling (BJ).
- d. Bullying perception (PB).
- e. The bullying intervention; advising (IN), reporting to parents (IO), mediating (IM), applying physical sanction (IF).
- f. Bullying report; reporting to teachers (MG), reporting to parents (MO).

3.1.3 Participant Observation

Mack et al. (2005) explained that participant observation is part of qualitative method derived from conventional ethnographic study, and it helps the researchers to study the perceptions believed by a particular community. Participant observation is held within community environment, in locations considered to have the relevancy toward the research inquiries. The method is considered

distinguishing since the researchers try to engage closely to participants in their own environment rather than having the participants come to the researcher. Generally, participant observation is how to become an insider in order to observe and learn what life is like.

In this study, the researchers lived in both *pesantren* from the period of August to October 2016 (August to September in the *pesantren* in Lhokseumawe, & September to October in the *pesantren* in Banda Aceh). It was aimed to observe and participate in varying degrees within the researched community. In the early of August 2016, we went to the office of the Ministry of Religious affair in Lhokseumawe to obtain the permit as the entrance tickets for conducting the research in one of the *pesantren* in the city. After having the permit letter from the office of the Ministry of Religious affair, we went to the targeted *pesantren* to meet the *pesantren* director in order to ask the permission for doing the research in his *pesantren*. Because one of the researchers was the graduate from that *pesantren*, the *pesantren* director welcomed us warmly and allowed us to do the research in his *pesantren*. In the *pesantren*, we lived in one of the teachers' house. In the beginning of our living, we tried to approach the teacher living with us to dig the information concerning the researched topic. We also attempted to involves in the places where students gathered around with their friends such as; mosque, dormitory, canteen, and soccer field. When we observed students' dormitory and tried to interact with some students, we found an interesting phenomenon that we heard some students called their friend using weird names. We asked one of students about the phenomenon, and he explained that those weird names were his friends nicknames (Laqab). He also described that name-teasing happened commonly among students' interaction.

Additionally, in the middle of September 2016, we lived in in the *pesantren* in Banda Aceh. We also did the similar steps as what we did in the previous *pesantren* before staying there. We went to the office of the Ministry of Religious Affair in Banda Aceh to get the permit letter for conducting the

research in one of the *pesantren* in that district. But it was quite difficult for us to get the letter because the officer was unfriendly. After having the permit letter, we contacted one of the teachers teaching in the *pesantren* to ask the procedure of doing the research in the *pesantren*. The teachers told us that there was no such complicated procedure, and we were allowed to conduct the research in the institution. During our stay there, we found that name-teasing or name-calling was also quite frequent to occur among students. Another fascinating finding from our observation was that the senior students disciplined their junior using physical sanction such as asking their juniors to do push up for those who were late to attend the praying in the mosque.

Moreover, during the observation the researchers made as objective notes as possible and recorded all accounts of observations as field notes. The researchers also conducted many informal conversations and interactions with teachers and students at the *pesantren* during the observation period to enrich the data collection. We considered that informal conversation and interaction were important components for the additional data of the research. Moreover, living in the *pesantren* during the observation was very useful, because the researchers were able to gain the understanding toward physical, social, and cultural context built within the *pesantren* environment. The relationship among students, teachers or between teacher and student could be seen obviously. Through participant observation, the researchers were able to reveal some others significant aspects for a comprehensive comprehension of the research study such as; the *pesantren* policy toward bullying, and the *pesantren* culture in perceiving bullying behavior. Consequently, the participant observation not only helped the researchers to understand the data collection through another method (such as in-depth interviews), but also assisted the researchers to have a better understanding of the studied phenomena.

3.2 Data Analysis

The in-depth interviews were recorded, transcribed, categorized and analyzed using the Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) and phenomenography. Essentially, phenomenology is the study of self-lived experience of a certain phenomenon (Larsson & Holmstrom, 2007). Phenomenology concerns to the approach that appears to individuals in their lived experiences. It means that it aims at recognizing the essential aspect of a certain phenomenon or experience of an individual which is distinctive from others. In other words, the researchers focus on the particular rather the universal (Pietkiewicz & Smith, 2014). This phenomenological analysis was addressed to the students' interviews as the need for the data triangulation.

Furthermore, the phenomenography was the core analysis of this research. The *phenomenographic* study and the theory of learning and awareness basically has been developed by Marton and Booth (1997). "The phenomenography is the study of how people experience, understand or conceive of a phenomenon in the world around us" (Larsson & Holmstrom, 2007, p. 56). The exploration is not pointed at the phenomena, but at the disparity in people's ways of comprehending the phenomena. In other words, in the *phenomenographic* study the main objective of the data analysis is to uncover the variation in ways of experiencing the phenomenon under investigation (Holubek, 2015).

In doing the analysis, the researchers concentrated on the collective experience of the research participants. Particularly, the transcribed interviews were deliberated as a unified dataset, and the individual participant's answer was not the concentration within this present study. The variation of the ideas that phenomenography searched for was discovered within the range of experiences and understanding of the whole sample group – as a group's participants – not in the range of experiences

of each individual in the sample. Practically, the process of analysis included categorization and compared the statements, themes and ideas as participants' perceptions.

The applied data analysis in this study used the inductive manner, and it involved seven steps of analysis (Holubek, 2015). Inductive data analysis in qualitative study concerns to the bottom-up approach to the data; the themes and categories of the data are organized into progressively more abstract units of information (Creswell, 2007, as cited in Holubek, 2015). Thus, following the Holubek work (2015), the seven steps involved in analyzing the data were:

1. Transcribing the interviews and selecting the relevant utterances
2. Coding the relevant utterances
3. Grouping the utterances according to similarity of themes (Thematic analysis)
4. Building the preliminary set of categories of description and looking for further varieties of conceptions
5. Going back to transcripts and adjusting the categories of description
6. Analyzing the categories in terms of their structural and referential aspects (data) and formulating the final set of categories of descriptions (data + literature).
7. Discussing the data and literature

Based on the above steps of analysis, after transcribing all the recorded data, in the coding stage there were sixteen codes that were later grouped into six themes. The themes were created based on the similarity of the utterances – the utterances referred to the same theme that were grouped together. The six themes were further analyzed and developed for several categories of description of the analysis stage – four for the theme “The teachers’ perception of bullying behavior at *pesantren*” and five for the theme “The teachers’ intervention toward bullying behavior at *pesantren*”. The next step was to create the referential and structural aspect based on those divided themes. The researcher was also reading

some relevant literatures and the ideas which further crystallized. In the section of “Research findings and Discussions” the researchers would describe in details the final set of categories’ description.

3.3 Ethical Consideration

In conducting this research, there were several ethical guidelines becoming the researchers’ consideration. Respect for intellectual property and no plagiarism were two main issues which the researchers’ concerned in this study. The distribution of consent letter to the interviews’ participants during the fieldwork research was also considered as the researchers’ ethical consideration. In addition, according to *The Belmont Report* (Mack et al., 2005) there are three other core values accepted as foundation for research principles. Firstly, respect for the autonomy of research participants. The research participant might not be intervened by any research interest. Secondly, the researchers must ensure that the research participants were not responsible for any risk of the research. Finally, justice involved an assurance to guarantee the fairness allocation of benefits resulting from this research.

4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The study has found various interesting findings that are related to the research topic. The data analysis of this study employed the seven steps of analysis as mentioned in the previous chapter. The following section will present the research findings and discussions based on two main research questions:

1. How do teachers at Modern Islamic Boarding School (Pesantren) perceive bullying behavior?
2. What kinds of intervention teachers employ at the modern *pesantren* to prevent bullying?

In this study, we will first portray the teachers' perceptions regarding the bullying behavior by explaining four categories of description (Categories 1-4), defining their structural and referential aspects, and discussing them with the constructed theories within this present study. We will do the same with five other categories of description (Categories 5-9) that are related to teachers' interventions in preventing bullying behaviors. The categories which will be explained and discussed below are constructed from the informants' utterances during the coding stage of the data analysis.

4.1 Categories Related to the Teachers' Perceptions of Bullying Behavior

In order to answer the first research question, "How do teachers at Modern Islamic Boarding School (Pesantren) perceive bullying behavior?", after transcribing and coding the interviews data, the researchers constructed four categories of description based on teacher participants' utterances concerning their perceptions of bullying behavior. These four categories were taken from four different perceptions of the bullying problem, and they are presented in the Table 1 below.

Table 1: Categories related to the teachers' perception of bullying behavior

Category 1	Bullying is related to teasing, mocking or name calling
Category 2	Bullying is related to the physical attack of seniors to juniors
Category 3	Bullying is related to threatening
Category 4	Bullying is caused by school culture

In this section, we are going to discuss each of these categories by including the participants' quotes and codes. The attached informants' codes are as follow;

1. IMU01 – the first teacher informant in Lhokseumawe
2. IMU02 – the second teacher informant in Lhokseumawe
3. IMU03 – the third teacher informant in Lhokseumawe
4. IMU04 – the fourth teacher informant in Lhokseumawe
5. IMU05 – the fifth teacher informant in Lhokseumawe
6. IMUS01 – the first student informant in Lhokseumawe
7. IMUS02 – the second student informant in Lhokseumawe
8. IMUS03 – the third student informant in Lhokseumawe
9. IDU01 – the first teacher informant in Banda Aceh
10. IDU02 – the second teacher informant in Banda Aceh
11. IDU03 – the third teacher informant in Banda Aceh
12. IDU04 – the fourth teacher informant in Banda Aceh
13. IDU05 – the fifth teacher informant in Banda Aceh
14. IDUS01 – the first student informant in Banda Aceh
15. IDUS02 – the second student informant in Banda Aceh

16. IDUS03 – the third student informant in Banda Aceh

17. IDUS04 – the fourth student informant in Banda Aceh

In addition, we will also analyze the referential and structural aspects for each category. Referential and structural aspects refer to “the specific *phenomenographic* analysis that is based on the anatomy of experience developed by Marton and Booth (1997, p.88)” (Holubek, 2015, p. 36). Marton and Booth (1997, as cited in Holubek, 2015, p.36) described the experience by separating two aspects as follow:

1. Referential aspect – what is the meaning, i.e. definition of the experience, and
2. Structural aspect – what is the structure, i.e. content of the experience, how is the phenomenon seen.

4.1.1 Category 1: Bullying is related to teasing, mocking or name calling

Teacher participants in this study perceived bullying behavior as closely related to teasing, mocking or name calling. Because phenomenography concerns on people experience to understand the phenomenon in the world around them, it is important to notice that in Category 1 the participants referred bullying behavior to the teasing, mocking or name calling phenomenon within *pesantren* environment. This category has two subcategories: (1) positive – teasing, mocking or name calling can lead to build positive engagement with peers; and (2) negative – teasing, mocking or name calling may humiliate others or bring to another harmful behavior such as fighting.

Teasing, mocking or name calling is perceived as positive:

“A habit and part of tradition within pesantren environment” (IMU05-school culture-LC), and

“Being teased or called by nasty name (Laqab) is considered familiar in pesantren atmosphere” (IDU02-school culture-LC)

For some students who deliberate the behavior as something positive, thus:

“The behavior can lead them to engage closely and build positive relationship with peers” (IMU03-school culture-LC).

On the contrary, teasing, mocking or name calling is also considered as bullying behavior which is negative. For instance:

“A student whose face looks older than his age is called by Atok. It is a word which usually used to label old people in Aceh culture. Or a student with obesity is named by Teletubbies” (IMU01-teasing & name calling-BM & BJ).

Teletubbies basically was a popular pre-school children’ television series with the chubby four multi-colored toddlers. In addition:

“Students who report that they are bullied by teasing, mocking or name calling are mostly grade 7 and 8 since they could not differentiate between playful and humiliating” (IMU03-teasing & name calling-BM & BJ). But,

“The students in grade 9 to 12 rarely report that they are bullied by teasing, mocking or name calling” (IMU04-teasing & name calling-BM & BJ).

Moreover, most students at grade 7 and 8 who could not accept that they are teased or called by nasty names will initiate fighting, as explained by one of the participants:

“About 70% - 80% of the teasing occurrence leads to the fighting” (IMU03-teasing & name calling-BM & BJ).

Another participant also told the same that:

“Most of teasing occurrence at the lower grade level in the pesantren bring somebody to another aggressive behavior such as fighting” (IDU04-teasing & name calling-BM & BJ).

Based on the informants’ answer regarding the Category 1, we can see that the idea expressed in the Category 1 (bullying is related to teasing, mocking or name calling) is closely linked to the Category 4 (bullying is caused by school culture). The connection can be seen from the answer of the participants that teasing, mocking or name calling is already a habit and tradition within *pesantren* environment. It means that the behavior is embedded within students’ interaction in the *pesantren*. Even though, there

are some cases of the bullying behavior which results to the physical attack, it still endures, and by the time going or by the higher grade the students are, in that, teasing, mocking or name calling will be acceptable among them. Lastly, as part of *phenomenographic* analysis and a summary of the Category 1, the referential and structural aspects are presented in the Table 2 below (similar table will be made for each following category).

Table 2: Referential and structural aspects of Category 1

Category 1: bullying is related to teasing, mocking or name calling	
Referential aspect	Structural Aspect
Subcategory 1: Teasing, mocking or name calling can lead to build positive engagement with peers	Teasing, mocking or name calling is a tradition within <i>pesantren</i> settings and many students are familiar with the behavior. Most of students use teasing or name calling to engage closely among them.
Subcategory 2: teasing, mocking or name calling may humiliate others or bring to another harmful behavior such as fighting.	Teasing, mocking or name calling is negative for some students at grade 7 and 8 since they could not distinguish well between playful and humiliating. Those students who could not accept of being teased or called by nasty names will act aggressively toward the perpetrator.

As can be expected from the findings above, the study of bullying perception has been examined in many studies (Boulton, 1997; Hazler et al. 2001; Dake et al. 2003; Beebout-Bladholm, 2010). Those studies described that many teachers have different views to perceive bullying. Many of them only concentrate on physical forms of bullying, and ignore verbal and social forms of bullying behavior within school environment. However, in the present study the researchers found that the teachers at the *pesantren* noticed that the occurrences of bullying are more in the form of verbal bullying (e.g. teasing, mocking or name calling). As previously explained, the Category 1 (bullying is related to teasing, mocking or name calling, table 2) was the most common type of bullying which appeared during the interviews. The teacher participants described that teasing, mocking or name calling is the most frequent form of bullying occurring among students' interactions within the *pesantren*. A survey conducted by Land (2003) and Smith et al. (2010) also portrayed that teasing or name calling is the most repeated type of bullying experienced by students at school.

Additionally, the teachers at the *pesantren* sometimes faced difficulties in judging the teasing behavior whether as playful or humiliating, since playful is considered as prosocial behavior, while humiliating is regarded as bullying. A similar issue is also discussed in Keltner et al. (2001) that teasing is considered as an ambiguous behavior because it is difficult to measure whether it is playful or humiliating. Smith et al. (2010) also said that teasing is often difficult to differ from other forms of student interaction within the school community. Therefore, the teachers at the *pesantren* confront difficulties in intervening in teasing behavior because the perpetrator considered his teasing as playful, but the victim interpreted it as humiliating. Regarding this dilemma, the intention to harm, besides repetition and imbalance of power within teasing behavior, is not necessarily intended by the offender to hurt or harm, but if it is taken as such by the victim, it is counted as bullying which needs intervention (Monk & Smith, 2006).

Another issue in bullying perception is the students' age. Younger and older students may define bullying behavior differently. Smith et al. (2002) described that younger children may not distinguish well between bullying and fighting, and they use the term bullying to address other negative behaviors even when no imbalance of power has occurred. Younger et al. (1986) reported that the definition of bullying will be better defined by children as they grow older. In this study, we discovered that the majority of students who reported being bullied were in grades 7 and 8, and most of them reported being teased, mocked or called nasty names. The occurrence of teasing among seventh and eighth graders even leads to fighting sometimes. On the other hand, the teacher participants perceived that the report of being teased by peers for ninth to twelfth grades was rare. Thus, as students grow older, they might not consider teasing, mocking or name-calling as part of bullying behavior.

4.1.2 Category 2: Bullying is related to the physical attack of seniors on juniors

Perceiving bullying connected to the physical attack of seniors on junior appeared several times during the interviews. The informants explained that in many occasions the physical attack of seniors on juniors was triggered by unacceptable teasing, mocking or name calling. The participant told us that about a week before we did the interview that:

“There was a student in grade 8 hit his junior in grade 7 because he could not accept of being mocked by his junior” (IMU03-seniors bully juniors-BP).

“Another student of grade 11 who took two pieces of chicken at the pesantren cafeteria when dinner time was teased by his junior of grade 10 by calling him greedy since only one piece of chicken is allowed to be taken for each student. Because he felt humiliated, then he punched his junior in front of many other students” (IDUS01-seniors bully juniors-BP).

“There was also a student of grade 8 who smoked behind the dormitory, and suddenly he was caught by his seniors of grade 11. Because smoking is forbidden within pesantren environment, his seniors punched and kicked him in order to punish him to stop smoking” (IMUS01-seniors bully juniors-BP).

The phenomenon of seniors' physical attack on juniors is pretty frequent in the *pesantren*. As exemplified above that some occurrences were caused by unacceptable teasing, mocking or name calling by juniors. Another occurrence was also caused by the *pesantren* policy giving the senior students of grade 11 and 12 the authority to discipline their juniors. Considering of having power and authority to regulate juniors, it sometimes makes them easily to attack their juniors physically. Therefore, the Category 2 (bullying is related to the physical attack of seniors on juniors) can be linked to the Category 4 (bullying is caused by school culture). The connection of the category can be reflected from the participants' information that the organizational structure of the *pesantren* which included senior students of grade 11 and 12 to be supervisors for their juniors has directed them to do physical attack in disciplining their juniors.

Table 3: Referential and structural aspects of Category 2

Category 2: bullying is related to the physical attack of seniors to juniors	
Referential aspect	Structural Aspect
Perceiving bullying connected to the physical attack of seniors on juniors is in a sense of physical bullying with imbalance of power.	Bullying linked to the physical attack of seniors on juniors can come in two ways. First, it was triggered by objectionable of teasing, mocking or name calling did by juniors. Second, having the authority to discipline and punish their juniors makes them easily to attack physically.

Basically, the bullying behavior in the form of physical attack of seniors on juniors have been previously studied by Basyiruddin (2010) and Rahmawati (2016). They reported that two students from *pesantren* Assalam, Sukoharjo, Central Java, were hospitalized due to physical bullying by their seniors in 2007 (Basyiruddin, 2010), and four in ten students of *pesantren* Assanusi, Cirebon were also physically bullied by their senior peers. Similar findings were also discovered from the present research. From the interviews, the teacher participants described that the physical attack of seniors on juniors (Category, table 2) was quite frequent within the investigated *pesantren*. They explained that the *pesantren* structure and policy give the authority for senior students (grade 10 to 12) to discipline their juniors, and it becomes one of the causes for physical attack/bullying to occur between seniors and juniors. Most of the senior students abuse their power and authority to bully their juniors in order to prove their existence.

The issue was studied by Francia and Edling (2016) in their investigation of children's violence at Swedish Boarding School. They found that the students at Lundsberg Swedish Boarding School applied the slogan 'proof of existence'. It means that the students who refuse take part in this 'proof of existence' activity risked being excluded from the community. Unfortunately, the motto was applied negatively, by bullying other out-group peers in order to prove their existences; that they belonged to a particular group within a community. The phenomenon is described as the result of a social environment where particular norms and values are communicated via students' daily interaction.

Another theory concerning the phenomenon of senior physical attack/bullying of juniors within the *pesantren* environment can be described using the theory of social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). The theory offers that an individual's belief and perception toward in-group and out-group elements originate from a desire to recognize that his/her group is better or superior compared to other groups. The result of this process will direct a particular person to show his/her favoritism to in-group

members. On the other hand, the person will discriminate against out-group members since he/she perceives out-group members as being different from his/her own group. Therefore, most of the senior students at the *pesantren* keep bullying their juniors in order prove their existence and to show the superiority of their group compared to other groups.

4.1.3 Category 3: Bullying is related to threatening

Threatening is one of bullying forms, and it also occurs at the *pesantren*. The present study discovered that the participants perceived bullying connected to threatening happening among students' interaction. The occurrence of threatening is considered harmful for victim's mental distress.

"Sometimes I found students who are hesitant to report of being bullied by peers because the perpetrator threatened the victim that the victimization would be worse if he reported to teachers regarding bullying occurrence" (IDUS01-threatening-BA).

The participant also described that:

"There was a victim who felt doubtful to report of being bullied by his friend because he was afraid that most of perpetrator's friends would get mad to him" (IMU02-threatening-BA).

Based on the description of the Category 3 (bullying is related to threatening), we can notice that it has a close correlation with the Category 4 (bullying is caused by school culture). The *pesantren* culture has the slogan '*Ukhwah Islamiyah*' which means Islamic solidarity. Essentially, the value of Islamic solidarity is positive because it obligates every Muslim to be kind and helpful for others in every occasion. But, some students at the *pesantren* comprehend the value of solidarity negatively. They assume that helping and supporting friends with negative behavior are also part of solidarity, and it becomes the culture and tradition in the *pesantren*. As a result, a bullied student feel hesitant to report the bullying occurrence to teachers, not only because the victim afraid of the perpetrator but also

because the perpetrator's friends are also following to threat the victim, and it causes the victim stressful.

Table 4: Referential and structural aspects of Category 3

Category 3: bullying is related to threatening	
Referential aspect	Structural Aspect
Bullying is linked to threatening, and it causes mental distress for victim	Bullying connected to threatening can cause students to feel hesitant or doubtful to report bullying occurrence to teachers, and it is difficult for teachers to detect bullying behavior due to no report.

Based on the findings above, it reveals that the teacher participants also perceived threatening as part of bullying behavior. The teachers explained that some students felt worried and hesitant to report being bullied to teachers because they were threatened by the perpetrators for not reporting it. If they reported, the bullying occurrence would be worse. This phenomenon can also be linked to the Category 4 (bullying is caused by school culture) of bullying perception. The bullying phenomenon within the *pesantren* environment becomes a culture because of two issues; firstly, as formerly described that teasing, mocking or name calling is a habit and tradition at the *pesantren*, and almost every student has the nasty name. In considering to this case, teachers at the *pesantren* have difficulties in recognizing whether it is bullying or not. This tradition leads to the generalization that every student at the *pesantren* can be teased, mocked or called by nasty names, though essentially not all of them are happy. Therefore, whenever a student objects of being teased or bullied and tries to report the

occurrence to teachers, the offenders will label the victim as coward. Therefore, the second issue is that because the victims afraid of being labelled by coward, or the victimization will be worse by their reports, thus, the phenomena last longer and become the culture.

In addition, the connection of the bullying issue in the form of threatening with the *pesantren* culture probably can be explained with the socio-cultural theory. The theory has been developed by Hancourt et al. (2014). The theory explains that bullying as a complex social phenomena affected by many social variables within a child such as; school, home, peer, and community environments. Even a very young child is profoundly surrounded by a complex social environment with a continuous interaction and communication of the actor and the environment. In this theory, bullying needs to be perceived in the cultural context of the organization where it originates. This theory also offers to see bullying as a behavior connected to the community. Therefore, the continuous interaction among students within the *pesantren* community with the permissiveness of bullying behavior (e.g. teasing, mocking, name-calling or even threatening) makes the issue to stay longer and transform to be the culture and tradition within the *pesantren* environment.

4.1.4 Category 4: Bullying is caused by school culture

Bullying is perceived closely related to school culture. As previously mentioned, the Category 1 (bullying is related to teasing, mocking or name calling) and the Category 3 (bullying is related to threatening) has a strong correlation to the Category 4 (bullying is caused by school culture). The frequency of bullying within the *pesantren* environment is quite frequent, especially teasing, mocking or name calling. Teachers at the *pesantren* also face difficulties to identify this type of bullying as playful or humiliating, since it is a habit and tradition within the *pesantren* community. Another issue is that most of victims are hesitant to report being victimized by their peers, because bullying

perpetrators threat the victim that the victimization will be getting worse by their report. The teacher participant described as follows:

“Whenever a student try to report being teased or mocked by his friends, the frequency of teasing will be worse. Even the bullied student will be labelled as coward by his peers if he reports to teachers” (IMU05-school culture-LC).

Therefore, the victims start defending themselves from being teased or mocked by teasing or mocking others as well, in that, the bullying occurrence within the *pesantren* environment becomes a culture.

Table 5: Referential and structural aspects of Category 4

Category 4: bullying is related to school culture	
Referential aspect	Structural Aspect
Bullying becomes a school culture because the victims transform themselves to be the bully as well	Bullying connected to school culture is derived from two structures. Firstly, teasing, mocking or name calling is difficult to be identified as playful or humiliating. Playful is acceptable, but humiliating is part of bullying. Secondly, threatening toward the bullied students for not reporting to teachers makes bullying last longer and becomes a culture.

The theory of Bronfenbrenner (1979, as cited in Espelage & Swearer, 2004) ‘socio-ecological theory’ probably can describe the phenomenon above. The occurrence of bullying is not in isolation, but it is a result of the complex relationship among many integrated systems such as; individual, peer group,

family, school, community, and culture. Basically, individual is the core of his/her social ecology, but an individual makes an active connection to his/her family, peer group, school, and community cultural context where she/he resides. According to Bronfenbrenner (1979), individuals as an inseparable part of a social network consist of our interconnected systems; microsystem, mesosystem, *exosystem*, and *macrosystem*. Microsystem comprises a child's association to a particular system such as; home or school. For instance, a child has a direct connection to peer group which is likely to bully others. This direct connection makes the child to involve as well in bullying behavior. Subsequently, the mesosystem incorporates the interconnection of a child life's system (e.g., home and school). The mesosystem portrays the equivalent of two or more circumstances, such as the equivalent between residential setting and school concerning bullying issue. The *exosystem* involves the impact from other context, such as the influence of an anti-bullying policy or parental involvement within school structure. Lastly, the *macrosystem* is the impact of cultural background which involves the public standpoints toward the bullying issue (Espelage & Swearer, 2004).

The idea above confirms the phenomena within the *pesantren* environment. Usually the suspected bully is a student who belongs to a group of bullies (microsystem). In addition, the equivalent of two situations (school and dormitory) at the *pesantren* makes the occurrence of bullying more vulnerable (mesosystem), as discussed by Pfeiffer and Pinquart (2014) that the bullying at boarding school is likely to befall more often because students meet the same bullies at school and their dormitory. The more level of contact among students, the higher the vulnerability of bullying to occur (Pfeiffer and Pinquart, 2014). Moreover, the bullying behavior (e.g. teasing, mocking, or name calling) essentially has been stated within the handbook of student discipline guidance (GDS) as part of the *pesantren* rule's violation, but it is not comprehended well by all the *pesantren*'s elements. That is why bullying is still vulnerable to happen at the institution (*exosystem*). Finally, the *pesantren* culture and

tradition with teasing, mocking, or name calling makes the bullying behavior lasts longer within the *pesantren* environment (*macrosystem*).

Another issue which emerges the bullying behavior at the *pesantren* is the diversity of students' family background. The students' background who enroll to the *pesantren* are economically from the middle and upper class family, and some of them are from the broken home family. Especially, the students who are exposed by the violence at home tend to bully others at the *pesantren*. Based on the interviews data, the participants expressed that most of the suspected bully were the students with the violence's experiences at their homes. Since the teacher participants in the present study are in charge as dormitory teachers who supervise and communicate frequently with students, thus, they know that most of the bullying perpetrators in the *pesantren* experience the violence at their homes. As a result, the teachers cannot intervene those students effectively, because their bullying behaviors are the consequences of home violence. Regarding to this fact, Bandura in his social cognitive learning and modelling (2001) illustrated that people are able to learn by seeing and observing others in social context within a particular environment. It means that people learn new attitude by replicating the conduct of others. Likewise, the violent experience of a child within a family will vitally influence to the involvement of bullying behavior (Bandura, 1977, as cited in Repo, 2015), in that, the students initiating and involving in bullying at the *pesantren* are mostly the students with the violent experience. Those reasons above make the bullying behavior to be a culture within the *pesantren* environment. Although the *pesantren* rules deny the occurrence of bullying, it occurs. It means that the cultural interaction made by the students is stronger than the *pesantren's* written rules. Therefore, it is not to tighten the rules in preventing the issue, but all school personnel must be internalized by the value of respect others and the awareness toward the dangerousness of bullying behavior.

4.2 Categories Related to the Teachers' Intervention to Prevent Bullying

The second research question, “What kinds of intervention teachers employ at the modern *pesantren* to prevent bullying? The analysis of five categories are also taken from the participants’ utterances concerning teachers’ interventions in preventing bullying behavior at the *pesantren*. The table will be presented below (Table 6).

Table 6: Categories related to the teachers’ intervention to prevent bullying

Category 5	Intervening by using <i>pesantren</i> policy
Category 6	Intervening by advising
Category 7	Intervening by mediation
Category 8	Intervening by parents’ meeting
Category 9	Intervening by physical sanction

Similar to the previous subsection, we will discuss each of these categories in details and illustrate the conceptions with participants’ quotes and codes. We will also analyze the connections between categories and present the referential and structural aspects for each individual category.

4.2.1 Category 5: Intervening by using *pesantren* policy

In this present research, we discovered that one of the interventions employed to prevent bullying is using *pesantren* policy. Both the researched *pesantren* have similar regulation toward the bullying issue. Both *pesantren* have a handbook of students’ discipline guidance (Gerakan Disiplin Santri, GDS) which discusses the *pesantren*’s regulation in details, and the punishment for every rules’ violation, including bullying. One *pesantren* divides the level of violation into three levels; light breach

of conduct, significant breach of conduct, and severe breach of conduct. The teacher participant told as follow:

“Bullying in the form of teasing, mocking or name calling is considered in the level of light breach of conduct. The punishment given by teachers for this type of violation is an advice for not repeating it. But, if the occurrence of teasing, mocking or name calling leads to the physical attack or even fighting because probably the teased student objects of being teased, thus, this violation is regarded as severe breach of conduct. The sanction applied for this breach is hair balding” (IMU01-school policy-LP).

Another *pesantren* applies the point accumulation system to punish every violation. The teacher’s participant in the *pesantren* described that:

*“Bullying in the form of mocking or name calling is deliberated as light violation, and the point given is 5. But, if it turns to be more serious from verbal bullying to physical bullying, the point will be 50 or 75. These ranges of point mean that it is a severe conduct of violation. The student’s parent will be invited to the *pesantren* to sign a contract letter stating that the repetition of the breach of conduct will be fired from the *pesantren*” (IDU02-school policy-LP).* Moreover,

*“the *pesantren* policies regarding bullying issue as mentioned above have been socialized to students at least two times in a year, and the handbook of students’ discipline guidance is also disseminated to each student in every new academic year” (IMU03 & IDU02-school policy-LP)*

It means that ideally a good socialization reduces the occurrence of bullying. But based on a student’s participant interview, he told that:

*“I have been being a victim of verbal and physical bullying for three years from grade 7. Even though, I reported to teachers of what I suffered and teachers punished the perpetrator based on the guideline of *pesantren*’s policy, I am still being the object of bullying from peers” (IMUS02-school policy-LP).*

Implicitly, it shows that intervention by employing school policy is not enough to prevent bullying. It is not only about the written stuff regulating everything in details, but also it is about building all students’ and teachers’ awareness to realize that bullying is a harmful behavior. Based on the description above, this Category has a correlation to the rest Categories 6, 7, 8 and 9, since this Category includes the other four Categories.

Table 7: Referential and structural aspects of Category 5

Category 5: Intervening by using <i>pesantren</i> policy	
Referential aspect	Structural Aspect
Employing intervention by using <i>pesantren</i> policy to prevent bullying is good because there is a written stuff that any students can refer themselves as the ethic or code of conduct	Preventing bullying by using <i>pesantren</i> policy is a good strategy, but it is not always effective. Besides the written regulation, the <i>pesantren</i> must prepare another strategy such as building awareness for everybody to realize that bullying behavior is dangerous.

Basically, the issue of teachers' intervention is related of how teachers perceive bullying behavior. Many studies discussed that most of teachers do not perceive bullying correctly or appropriately, thus, their responses and interventions are also not effective (Stephenson & Smith, 1989; Dake et al. 2003; Unnever & Cornell, 2003; Beebout-Bladholm, 2010). But, in this present research we found that all the teachers' participant perceive bullying as a serious problem which needs to be tackled. Besides physical and social bullying, they agreed that verbal bullying in the form of teasing, mocking or name calling should be reduced its occurrences, since many teasing behaviors led to another negative forms of aggression such as fighting. Therefore, they expressed several types of interventions employed to prevent bullying behavior as those categories above.

Furthermore, the *pesantren* policy includes teasing, mocking, or name calling as part of the *pesantren* rule's violation. It is categorized as the significant breach of conduct or the medium level of rule's violation. Usually, the punishment for this type of violation is cleaning bathroom and

dormitory's porch, and the punishment will be worse if students violate it repeatedly. Additionally, from the observation we discovered that although bullying is considered as part of policy's violation, the occurrence of bullying is still frequent within the *pesantren*. It is because the dangerousness of bullying behavior is only comprehended well by some teachers. The other teachers who are not in charge as dormitory teachers tend to ignore it, since they assume that is not their responsibilities. Therefore, it can be drawn that not all teachers at the *pesantren* commit to prevent bullying behavior, and obviously there is no good cooperation among teachers to cope with the issue. This situation makes the bullying behavior to grow rapidly and last longer. The circumstance reflects that the *pesantren*'s policy does not apply yet the whole school approach model. *The Olweus Bullying Intervention Program* or known as the whole school approach model which is developed by Dan Olweus concerns on all level of relationships within school context (Cecil & Molnar-Main, 2014). Students and teachers as part of school's community are trained equally to gain the essential information concerning bullying behavior and the strategy to respond it. At the classroom level, teachers must be able to hold a weekly classroom meetings and instructional curricula regarding the issue. Students must be trained well toward bullying situation by using pro-social behaviors (Olweus, 1993; Smith, Schneider et al., 2004, as cited in Losey, 2009). Thus, if the *pesantren* policy includes the strategy of the whole school approach in preventing bullying by building the awareness of the harmfulness of bullying behavior within all levels of school personnel, the issue will probably downgrade significantly.

4.2.2 Category 6: Intervening by advising

Most of the participants told that the initial step to prevent bullying occurrence was by advising students for not doing such behavior. The frequency of giving advice related to the dangerous of bullying behavior was quite frequent, since most of them gathered with students at least once a week.

“The strategies that I usually use to deliver the advice for students regarding bullying are in two ways; gathering all dormitory students or one to one advice” (IMU01-intervening by advising-IN).

The teacher participant described that the intention of gathering all dormitory students to advise them considering bullying issue was to build the equal comprehension and awareness that bullying behavior must be avoided. While one to one advice was employed for the suspected bully. It was aimed to dig the information of why the bully bullied others, and this strategy was also used to build positive communication with the bully to prevent him from doing such behavior. Another teacher participant stated the similar notion as well:

“The initial step to prevent bullying within students’ interaction is by advising them in many occasions such in the mosque after communal praying or in the dormitory before they going to bed” (IDU04-intervening by advising-IN).

Considering the explanation above, the Category is closely related to the Category 5 (intervening by using *pesantren* policy). Delivering advice as part of intervention to prevent bullying has been stated in the handbook of students discipline guidance (GDS). Therefore, most of teacher participants who were asked about their initial procedures to prevent bullying, they answered delivering advice.

Table 8: Referential and structural aspects of Category 6

Category 6: Intervening by advising	
Referential aspect	Structural Aspect
Giving advice for students concerning the dangerousness of bullying behavior has been employed as the initial procedure in preventing bullying at the <i>pesantren</i> .	Advising is frequently used by teachers to prevent bullying within the <i>pesantren</i> . Delivering advice can come in two ways; gathering all students or one to one advice.

Regarding the finding above, delivering advice is one of the most common strategies employed by the teachers at the *pesantren* to intervene bullying behavior. The teachers usually deliver the advice using two ways; gathering all dormitory students or one to one advice. As formerly explained, the aim of gathering all dormitory students is to advise them about the harmfulness of bullying behavior and to build the equal comprehension and awareness that bullying behavior must be avoided. While one to one advice is used for the suspected bully in order to dig his reason bullying others and to build positive communication with the bully. Basically, this strategy is quite similar to the method of shared concern. It is a non-punitive intervention to interfere student identified as bully. The one-to-one interview is employed within the method. The aim of the method is to gain the acknowledgement from the suspected bully that there is a child who is having a hard time and feel stressful because of bullying. In this method, the interaction can be more intimate, and the teacher is also able to advise the bully from heart to heart for not repeating such kind of behavior (Rigby, 2014).

Moreover, the teacher participants also admitted that although they advised students regularly concerning the dangerousness of bullying, its occurrence was still frequent among students' interaction. This situation is probably caused by the ignorance of the presence peers during the bullying occurrence. Jeffrey (2004), in his investigation reported that peers present in 85% of bullying occurrence, but they intervened in only 10% episodes (Padget & Notar, 2013). Therefore, to reinforce the presence peers (bystander) to actively prevent the bullying episode is also crucial. It is probably better or more effective to reinforce the presence bystanders to intervene bullying behavior within the *pesantren* environment in order to reduce its occurrence rather than relying on the *pesantren* policy. One of the programs which has been successfully applied in Finland to reinforce bystander in reducing bullying occurrences is KiVa. It is the intervention program which has been tested and developed in Finland. Salmivalli et al. (2010, as cited in Williford, 2012) described that KiVa program perceives

bullying as a group process in which the bully acts assertively for obtaining higher peer-group status, and the behavior is repeatedly supported by the ignorance of bystanders. Additionally, the program is designed to reinforce students' involvement to prevent bullying among their peers and also to defend victims from bullies. The KiVa program emphasizes on enhancing bystanders' abilities to support victimized friends. However, how bystanders behave depends on their status: (a) outsiders is someone not involving in bullying experiences among their schoolmates; (b) defenders, who tends to help the victims in bullying occurrences; (c) guilty bystanders, who did nothing to help the victims but felt guilty about it; and (d) unconcerned bystanders, who saw the victimized friends without feeling responsible to help or do something (Padget & Notar, 2013). Therefore, implementing KiVa program by reinforcing peer involvement in bullying episode to act as defender bystander is significantly important to reduce bullying within the *pesantren* environment.

4.2.3 Category 7: Intervening by mediation

Mediation is another type of intervention employed in the *pesantren* to prevent bullying behavior.

Some of the teacher participants described that they used mediation to intervene bullying issue:

"I usually mediate students involving in bullying. I invited both bully and victim to come to my office and asked them one by one without interrupting the chronology of bullying incident. After getting the comprehensive information regarding the bullying incidents, I asked the bully to think the solution in order to recover the situation. In the end, I required them to handshake as the symbol the problem solved" (IMU04-intervening by mediation-IM).

"A few days ago I was reported by a student that he was bullied by his roommate. Then, I only invited the bully to come to my room, and I interrogated him about the reason of why he did bullying. I also asked him to think and imagine if he was in the victim's position. Lastly, I advised him for not repeating such behavior, and before he left I also required him to meet the victim and apologize in order to recover the condition" (IDU03-intervening by meditation-IM).

Basically, the intervention by mediation is quite effective to reduce bullying problem. Because by having the mediation a bully student is able to know how the victim's feeling is. By knowing it, the bully can reflect himself and imagine if he were the victim. It is expected that the bully will stop bullying others after knowing the suffering of the victim. Even though, this type of intervention is applied by some of teacher participants in the study, mediation is not part of intervention procedure within the handbook of students' discipline guidance (GDS) at the *pesantren*. It means that the mediation is not part of the *pesantren* policy to prevent bullying problem. Thus, it is better for the *pesantren* policy maker to include mediation as part of bullying intervention procedure to reduce bullying issue.

Table 9: Referential and structural aspects of Category 7

Category 7: Intervening by mediation	
Referential aspect	Structural Aspect
Intervening bullying by mediation is another strategy to cope with bullying behavior	Intervening bullying by mediation is considered effective because the mediator is able to moderate the problem and recover the situation with the presence of both bully and victim. This type of intervention is also reflective for the bully

The third type of intervention employed by the teacher participants is mediation. The teachers usually mediate students involving in bullying. They invited both bully and victim to come to the *pesantren*'s office and asked them the chronology of bullying incident one by one without interrupting. After

getting the comprehensive information regarding the bullying incidents, they required the bully to think the solution in order to recover the situation. This part of intervention is also similar to the mediation approach studied by Rigby (2014). The steps applied are also alike. In this approach, the students are engaged in the process of finding a mutually acceptable result. The strategy also produces a high level of creative engagement to find an agreed solution on their problems (Rigby, 2014). This type of intervention is part of individual-focused intervention as proposed by Mann et al. (2015), since it interferes by identifying vulnerable students involving in bullying and mediates them to cope with the problem. Bullying on the individual-focused intervention is seen as personal effect or outcome. The concrete step of the individual-focused intervention is to identify properly a susceptible child or student involving in bullying behavior and find him/her an effective counseling to tackle the problem (Mann et al., 2015).

4.2.4 Category 8: Intervening by parents' meeting

Another type of intervention which is commonly employed at the *pesantren* is parents' meeting. What we mean by parents' meeting in this study is to invite parents' of the bully and victim to attend the meeting in order to moderate and overcome the problem. But, inviting parents to attend the meeting due to behavior problem is often as the sign of severe breach of conduct of the *pesantren* policy. It means that the repetition of the conduct by the bully will probably be fired from the *pesantren*.

“Whenever a particular student has involved in bullying occurrence for several times, his parents will be invited to attend the meeting in the pesantren. In the meeting, his parents will be told of the violation that has been done by him. The bully will also warn for the possibility of being expelled from the pesantren if he repeats the bullying behavior” (IMU03-intervening by parents' meeting-IO).

“The intention to hold parents' meeting is to inform the bully's parents concerning his negative behavior within his interaction with friends. After the meeting, the parents are hoped to assist in advising and warning his son for not repeating such negative

behavior. The assistance from parent in advising his son is expected to make the bully aware of the harmfulness of bullying, thus, he can decide to stop doing it” (IDU01 & IDU02-intervening by parents’ meeting-IO).

“The participants also told that not all parents who were invited to the meeting were cooperative with the pesantren staff, because some of them tried to blame the regulation and teachers’ supervision regarding the bullying occurrence which was caused by their son” (IDU03-intervening by parents’ meeting-IO).

Based on the information from the participants, we also found that to deal with parents concerning bullying problem is a challenge. Some parents are cooperative and try to help the teachers in advising their son for not bullying his peer. Otherwise, some other parents attempt to blame the teachers and complain the rules or policy of the *pesantren*. Therefore, the intervention through parents’ meeting in order to prevent bullying tend to be successful if the children involved in the bullying belong to the cooperative parents. But, if the parents are not supportive, the treatment is not effective.

Table 10: Referential and structural aspects of Category 8

Category 8: Intervening by parents’ meeting	
Referential aspect	Structural Aspect
Parents’ meeting intervention is one of strategies to build positive communication between parents and teachers at the <i>pesantren</i> in order to share the proportion of responsibility to prevent children from bullying behavior	Intervening bullying by parents’ meeting will result into two ways; first, the treatment tend to be positive if the invited parents are cooperative; second, the attempt to reduce bullying behavior from the students will be fail if their parents are not cooperative with teachers

Based on the finding above, another type of intervention employed by the teachers at the *pesantren* is parents' meeting. The intention of parents' meeting is to inform the bully's parents concerning the negative behavior of their son interaction with friends. The meeting is essentially expected that the parents can effectively advice their child for not repeating such negative behavior. The assistance from parents in advising their child is also aimed to raise the bully awareness of the harmfulness of bullying, thus, the bully can decide to stop doing it. This intervention is part of family-focused intervention since bullying is believed as the result of family or community interaction. The intervention encourages of how family, especially parents, synergize to develop a social support network by having good communication each other to prevent their children from bullying behavior (Mann et al., 2015).

4.2.5 Category 9: Intervening by physical sanction

The intervention using physical sanction is also discussed in the present study. What we mean by physical sanction in this research is not physical violence such as; slapping, hitting, kicking or punching. Those forms of punishment were applied a few years ago. But, the physical sanctions in this study are like standing under the sun for a few hours and hair balding.

“Usually the student who bullied his peers repeatedly, and his bullying conduct triggered to more harmful behavior such as fighting, thus, the punishment for him would be hair balding or being humiliated to stand under the sun for some hours in front of many other students” (IMU01-intervening by physical sanction-IF).

“If a bully student has been reminded several times for not bullying others, but he is still doing it, therefore, I will call him to my office, and the sanction for him will be hair balding” (IDU01-intervening by physical sanction-IF).

As part of physical sanction, hair balding is one of the most popular sanctions within the *pesantren* environment and is addressed to students violating the severe breach of conduct, including bullying behavior. Hair balding in the cultural context of the *pesantren* is the symbol of disgrace and

disobedient. Whenever a student is punished by hair balding, he will be labelled as a disobedient student within the *pesantren* community. Having this label, the student will be shy, and the label is expected to provide a deterrent effect for the student for not repeating a negative behavior.

Table 11: Referential and structural aspects of Category 9

Category 9: Intervening by physical sanction	
Referential aspect	Structural Aspect
Applying physical sanction as the intervention to prevent bullying is commonly employed within the <i>pesantren</i> . Types of the punishment are standing under the sun for some hours and hair balding. Those sanctions are implemented whenever the level of bullying is considered in the severe breach of conduct.	Intervening bullying by using physical sanction is considered reactive than proactive because it does not internalize any positive value for the bully. The sanction only tends to humiliate without touching the bully's awareness for not bullying others due to the dangerousness of such behavior.

As highlighted above, the physical sanction is also part of the intervention employed at the *pesantren*. Hair balding and standing under the sun are two types of physical sanction within the *pesantren* environment. Those are the most popular sanctions at the *pesantren* and are addressed to the student violating the severe breach of conduct, including bullying behavior. The interventions have the similarity with one of the reactive approaches proposed by Rigby (2014), direct sanction. This form of intervention does not encourage any creative engagement among the students involved in the bullying (Thompson & Smith, 2011, as cited in Rigby, 2014). In addition, the intervention like hair balding and standing under the sun are types of reactive punishment rather than proactive. The consequence of

those punishments is not positive for the bully since it just humiliates the bully for a temporary of time, and the bully did not get any positive value from the intervention. If suddenly the bully stop bullying others after getting the sanction, it is not because he is aware of the harmfulness of bullying, but it is because he just afraid of the sanction (Rigby, 2014). Therefore, it is possible in the future that he will do bullying over and over whenever he assumes that there will be none to punish him.

4.3 Other Relevant Observations

As formerly described, the main objective of data analysis in *phenomenographic* research is to uncover variety in ways of experiencing regarding the investigated phenomenon. In this study, the types of categories related to teachers' perceptions and their interventions concerning bullying issue at the *pesantren* is described through nine categories (4+5). Four categories for the bullying perceptions; bullying is related to teasing, mocking or name calling, bullying is related to the physical attack of seniors to juniors, bullying is related to threatening, and bullying is caused by school culture. While there are five categories for teachers' interventions; intervening by using *pesantren* policy, advising, mediation, parents' meeting, and physical sanction.

Moreover, since we conducted participant observation in this study, we lived in a month in each *pesantren* during the period of August to October 2016. Basically, participant observation in this study was aimed to confirm whether the interviews' data and information concerning bullying issue are in line with what we see and observe within the *pesantren's* life. Therefore, during our stay, besides interviewing the participants of the research, we also involved in some regular activities of the *pesantren* such as; doing communal praying in the mosque, playing soccer, having meal three times in the *pesantren's* cafeteria, and visiting students' dormitory. We considered that mosque, soccer field, cafeteria, and dormitory are the locations where students' interaction commonly take place, and it has

the possibility for bullying's occurrence. During our observation in those locations, we tried to act as insider or part of community in order to obtain the required data. In our observation, when we observed students' dormitory and tried to interact with several students, we found an interesting phenomenon that we heard some students called their friend using weird names. We asked one of students about the phenomenon, and he explained that those weird names were his friends nicknames (*Laqab*). He also described that name-teasing happened commonly among students' interaction, and even many dormitory teachers attempted to prohibit students from teasing their friends by using nasty names, they still did it. Another phenomenon that we found during the observation was that the senior students disciplined their junior using physical sanction such as asking their juniors to do push up for those who were late to attend the communal praying in the mosque. In addition, we also found two students with hair balding. Through informal conversation, they told us that their hair balding was caused by violating the *pesantren* rule, escaping from the *pesantren* without teacher's permission. They explained that the violated rule was part of sever breach of conduct, thus, they were punished by hair balding. They also told us that the bullying perpetrator could be punished by hair balding as well if the doer did it repeatedly overtime. Consequently, through the observation, the researchers were able to see that teachers' perceptions concerning bullying behavior were in accordance with their action to prevent it.

In this section, we highlight only one out of seven students that we interviewed. The reason why we only focus on one student in this part is because the interview answers of the rest six students were quite similar and normative. They seemed reluctant to answer the questions honestly, thus, we faced difficulties to uncover more information from them. They experienced of being bullied only one or twice a week. But, another student informant experienced of being victimized almost every day. In day 9 of observation, after performing communal praying in the mosque we tried to approach one student to do informal conversation in order to uncover the information of the investigated phenomena.

Actually, before conducting the conversation with that student, we were informed by other students that he has been being the bullying victim for three years. Thus, we selected him as one of student participants of the research. We addressed him some questions:

How was his experience of being bullied?

Did he report the experience of being bullied to the teachers?

What did the teachers say and think about his bullying experience?

And what was the teacher strategy to intervene his bullying experience?

He answered that:

“I have a very hard time within these three years because the majority of my classmates and roommates bully me. They bully me because I suffer from bed wetting. They tease and mock me almost every day in many occasions. But the more they bully me, the worse of bed wetting that I suffer. Basically, I have reported to my dormitory teacher that I feel ashamed of their teasing. The teacher showed me a very good response, and he encouraged me as well for not feeling afraid to report if someone do teasing or mocking. Another night after reporting it, my dormitory teacher gathered around all of dormitory members. He performed speech to advise everybody for not doing teasing to anybody, including me, and he also told that there would be more serious punishment for those who ignore his warning. But, some of my friends who previously bullied me called me coward because they knew that I reported their bullying to the teacher. Since then, I did not report the bullying occurrence anymore because the more I report the worse the victimization would be” (IMUS02).

The description above has a correlation to the Category 1 (bullying is related to teasing, mocking or name calling), Category 4 (bullying is caused by school culture), and Category 5 (Intervening by using school policy). As previously described, teasing, mocking or name calling can be either positive or negative, thus, teasing is often considered ambiguous. As described by Smith et al. (2010) that teasing can be a prosocial behavior whenever it is a friendly and playful interaction to do mockery and does not affect the victim to be humiliated, and it can be an anti-social behavior whenever it refers to name-calling, verbal harassment or taunting. Land (2003) suggested that some researchers deliberate teasing as part of bullying behavior, while some others disregard it (Boulton and Hawker, 1997; Hazler et al., 1997; Keltner et al., 1998; Ross, 1996; Olweus, 1999). Land (2003) also added that many researchers consider that teasing is acceptable within human interaction, because positively it can lead to build

positive engagement and interaction among people. But, Keltner et al. (2001) argued that teasing can lead to more disturbing ends, as when it humiliates or harasses. Therefore, whenever it is humiliating, it is considered as bullying behavior. In the case above, teasing is deliberated as bullying since the student feel embarrassed by his peers' teasing.

Furthermore, even though, the student shows his objection of being teased, his peers kept continuing insulting him. It portrays that bullying behavior is becoming a culture of the *pesantren*. The bullying occurrence is regarded as the *pesantren's* culture because the majority of students assume that the behavior like teasing, mocking or name calling is acceptable for most students, though the *pesantren's* policy bans it. As the case above, the bullying that suffered by the aforementioned student is becoming worse when he reported it to his dormitory teacher. It shows that the policy does not really work to prevent bullying since the teasing behavior within *pesantren's* environment is a habit for the majority of students. Finally, the ineffectiveness of the *pesantren* policy's intervention implies two issues; first, that the majority of students are lack of the understanding toward the harmfulness of bullying behaviors; second, the prevention of bullying is not applied by using the whole school approach, thus, the seriousness of bullying intervention and prevention is only understood by several teachers who are in charge as dormitory teachers. Therefore, applying the whole school approach program to prevent from the frequent occurrence of bullying among students in the *pesantren* is one of the solutions. The program is known as *Olweus Bullying Prevention Program* (Cecil & Molnar-Main, 2014). It was developed by Dan Olweus, the pioneer of research in bullying field. Ecologically, the whole-school approach considers all levels of the environment in the context of the relationship to school. It offers the prevention and intervention approaches with a variability of level of school ecology. At the school context, all school personnel and students are trained equally to obtain the substantial information regarding bullying behavior, the harmfulness of the behavior and the strategy to

respond it. School policy is also needed to address appropriate intervention and consequences for bullying occurrence. At the classroom level, teachers must be able to hold a weekly classroom meetings and instructional curricula regarding the issue. Students must be trained well toward bullying situation by using pro-social behaviors (Olweus, 1993; Smith, Schneider et al., 2004, as cited in Losey, 2009). Probably, if the *pesantren* can implement well this program in preventing bullying behavior, the problem will probably reduce significantly.

5 CONCLUSION

The last section of this study is conclusion. In the first subsection, we will summarize the main findings or categories and discuss the practical implications of the research as well as its limitations. The second subsection, we will provide the recommendations for further research.

5.1 Implication of the Research Findings

The main findings of the research are described through nine categories of description which represent nine different conceptions of teachers' perceptions and interventions concerning bullying behavior – four about the teachers' perceptions concerning bullying behavior and five others about the teachers' interventions toward the issue within the *pesantren* environment.

Four different perceptions about the idea of bullying behavior, meaning four different ways in perceiving bullying occurrence at the *pesantren*:

1. Bullying is related to teasing, mocking or name calling
2. Bullying is related to the physical attack of seniors to juniors
3. Bullying is related to threatening
4. Bullying is caused by school culture

There are five other categories related to teachers' intervention in preventing bullying behavior at the *pesantren* settings:

5. Intervening by using *pesantren* policy
6. Intervening by advising
7. Intervening by mediation

8. Intervening by parents' meeting
9. Intervening by physical sanction

Each category was further analyzed in terms of its referential and structural aspect (Chapter 4).

The aim of this study, as formerly described, is to obtain information of how teachers at the modern *pesantren* perceive bullying issue among students as well as explores what kind of interventions teacher employ at the *pesantren* to prevent bullying cases. Focusing on two modern *pesantren* in the capital city of Aceh province and another city in the northern part of Aceh, Lhokseumawe, and the fact that ten interviewed teachers cannot represent the entire teachers' population, as well as it does not allow us to generalize the research findings to all modern *pesantren*'s teachers. Still, the result of this study gives us a valuable preliminary insight into teachers' perceptions and their interventions toward bullying behavior at the modern *pesantren*.

There are several implications that can be drawn based on the present study. First of all, we can see that the bullying behavior in the form of teasing, mocking or name calling (Category 1) lasts longer within the *pesantren* environment. It is because the habit and tradition that calling others by nasty names is considered acceptable by most students at the *pesantren*. This acceptability makes the behavior to evolve as the *pesantren*'s culture (Category 4). This circumstance implicates the difficulties of the teachers to identify whether the behavior is playful or humiliating, and it leads to the complicatedness of how to cope with the problem. Even though the *pesantren*'s policy restricts teasing, the policy is not effective enough to reduce the problem. The ineffectiveness of the *pesantren* policy's implementation implies two issues; first, that the majority of students lack understanding of the harmfulness of bullying behaviors; second, the prevention of bullying is not applied by using the whole school approach, and, therefore, the seriousness of bullying intervention and prevention is only understood by several teachers who are in charge as dormitory teachers (Category 5).

Moreover, the types of intervention employed by the teachers at the *pesantren* employ a reactive approach rather than a proactive one. Besides the intervention using school policy, the interventions by advising (Category 6), mediation (Category 7), parents' meeting (Category 8), and physical sanction (Category 9) belong to the reactive approaches, which only solve the problem in the short-term. As proposed by Rigby (2014), using proactive or preventive strategies by creating or controlling the situation are preferable. KiVa model which was developed by Salmivalli, a Finnish professor in psychology, is worth trying. The model perceives that bullying behavior occurs frequently within the school community because of the ignorance of bystanders or onlookers. The student bystander usually tries to pretend to be unaware of bullying behavior. Thus, by building an awareness for every student to be a defender bystander who tends to help the victim in every bullying occurrence will effectively downgrade the problem (Williford et al., 2012; Padget & Notar, 2013). Consequently, a very clear practical implication of the research findings is that teachers and students must equally be trained in order to have the same perception that bullying is dangerous for the victim socially, mentally or even physically. The restriction of the *pesantren's* policy (Category 5) for not bullying, not only in the form of teasing, mocking or name calling but also in any other types, must be understood well by all elements within the *pesantren's* community.

As a result, the present study reveals that the teachers at the *pesantren* perceive bullying as dangerous behavior which needs to be tackled. The study also discovers that the teachers at the *pesantren* employ several interventions in the form of reactive approach rather than proactive. However, the fascinating finding from the present research is that the teachers' positive perception (bullying is harmful) and their concrete action to prevent bullying within the *pesantren* community cannot reduce its occurrence significantly. Particularly, teasing, mocking or name-calling is becoming the habit, tradition, and culture in the *pesantren* environment. Regarding this finding, thus, what is

wrong? And what can be done to improve the situation? Since bullying problem is individual and community problem by nature, social identity theory as suggested by Tajfel and Turner (1979, as cited in Gini, 2006) probably the answer. The theory offers that an individual belief and perception toward in group and out group elements consequently originate from their willingness to recognize that his/her group as being better or superior comparing to other groups. The result of this process will direct a particular person to show his/her favoritism to in-group members. On the other hand, the person will discriminate out-group members since he/she perceives that the out-group members as being different from his/hers. The bullying problem is also derived from this phenomenon. A bully perceives a victim as someone who is different from his/her group, thus, to prove the existence or the superiority of the group she/he will bully others. The bullying occurrence in the *pesantren* context is in equivalent to this theory. The victimized students or the labelled students by nasty names are those perceived as being different and inferior from the rest students at the *pesantren*. This fact shows that most of students less of empathy toward the victimized students. Therefore, to improve the situation, the institution probably can adopt *Olweus Bullying Prevention Program* (Cecil & Molnar-Main, 2014) and KiVa program (Salmivalli et al., 2010) to be implemented within the *pesantren* community. Olweus program or known as the whole school approach program encourages all school personnel and students to be trained equally to obtain the substantial information regarding bullying behavior, the harmfulness of the behavior and the strategy to respond it. In this program, students are also trained well to encounter the bullying situation by using pro-social behaviors (Olweus, 1993; Smith, Schneider et al., 2004, as cited in Losey, 2009). Additionally, KiVa is another program which can be adopted. Because the program encourages students to be more empathy toward the victimized student by being the defender bystander who tends to help the victims in the bullying episode. Consequently, implementing both

programs are expected to be the solution for eliminating the negative tradition of bullying within the *pesantren* environment.

Finally, in this present research there are three limitations that need to be noted. First is the language barrier that influenced the way we express the ideas in writing the findings of our research. Since we are not the native speakers, probably the logical order within this thesis is not flowing smoothly. Second, even though the topic of bullying has been widely discussed by thousands of journals, the lack of prior research studies on the topic of bullying within Modern Islamic Boarding Schools (*pesantren*) present a lack of comprehensive understanding toward the investigated research. A final limitation is the difficulty to deeply explore the data of the issue during the interview process because it is relatively sensitive to most teachers at the *pesantren* and is closely related to the schools' reputation.

5.2 Recommendations for further Research

The teachers' perceptions and their interventions of the bullying behavior is essentially has plenty of potential issues for further research. It would be interesting to further investigate how the school culture of Sukma Bangsa Pidie Boarding School deals with bullying behavior. The aforementioned school is considered exciting to be investigated because its environment is the combination between traditional and modern *pesantren*. Half of the total students are live-in students, while the rests are non-live-in students. The students are also very diverse. Besides local students, the Filipino students with the background of separatism conflict in Mindanao are also studying there. The ability of the school culture with those diverse students to internalize the value for not bullying each other is another fascinating issue to be inspected. Moreover, the school considers 'no bullying' as one of the core

values within the school community. Therefore, the issue of school culture in dealing and concerning bullying behavior within this institution could be scrutinized in the future.

REFERENCES

- Aluede, O., Adeleke, F., Omoike, D., & Afen-Akpaida, J. (2008). A review of the extent, nature, characteristics and effects of bullying behaviour in schools. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 35(2), 151-159.
- Ashiabi, G. S., & O'Neal, K. K. (2015). Child Social Development in Context. *SAGE Open*, 5(2), 2158244015590840.
- Baker, S. E., Edwards, R., & Doidge, M. (2012). How many qualitative interviews is enough?: Expert voices and early career reflections on sampling and cases in qualitative research.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual review of psychology*, 52(1), 1-26.
- Bass, L. R. (2014). Boarding schools and capital benefits: Implications for urban school reform. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 107(1), 16-35.
- Basyiruddin, F. (2012). *Hubungan antara penalaran moral dengan perilaku bullying para santri Madrasah Aliyah Pondok Pesantren Assa'adad Serang Banten*.
- Bauman, S., & Del Rio, A. (2005). Knowledge and beliefs about bullying in schools comparing preservice teachers in the United States and the United Kingdom. *School Psychology International*, 26(4), 428-442.
- Bauman, S., & Del Rio, A. (2006). Preservice teachers' responses to bullying scenarios: Comparing physical, verbal, and relational bullying. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(1), 219.
- Bauman, S., & Hurley, C. (2005). Teachers' attitudes and beliefs about bullying: Two exploratory studies. *Journal of School Violence*, 4(3), 49-61.

- Bear, G. G., Minke, K. M., & Thomas, A. (1997). *Children's Needs II: Development, Problems and Alternatives*. National Association of School Psychologists, 4340 East West Highway, Suite 401, Bethesda, MD 20814-9457.
- Beebout-Bladholm, T. M. (2010). *Teachers' Responses to Bullying Situations: The Elements that Influence Intervention*. ProQuest LLC. 789 East Eisenhower Parkway, PO Box 1346, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.
- Boulton, M. J. (1997). Teachers' views on bullying: Definitions, attitudes and ability to cope. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 67(2), 223-233.
- Boyce, C., & Neale, P. (2006). *Conducting in-depth interviews: A guide for designing and conducting in-depth interviews for evaluation input* (pp. 3-7). Watertown, MA: Pathfinder International.
- Cecen-Celik, H., & Keith, S. (2016). Analyzing Predictors of Bullying Victimization with Routine Activity and Social Bond Perspectives. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0886260516672941.
- Cecil, H., & Molnar-Main, S. (2015). Olweus Bullying Prevention Program: Components Implemented by Elementary Classroom and Specialist Teachers. *Journal of School Violence*, 14(4), 335-362.
- Coffee, A. W. (2004). *The influence of personal and environmental factors on teacher preference for intervention in student altercations* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Craig, W. M., Henderson, K., & Murphy, J. G. (2000). Prospective teachers' attitudes toward bullying and victimization. *School Psychology International*, 21(1), 5-21.
- Crothers, L. M., & Kolbert, J. B. (2008). Tackling a Problematic Behavior Management Issue Teachers' Intervention in Childhood Bullying Problems. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 43(3), 132-139.
- Dahlin, B. (2001). The primacy of cognition—or of perception? A phenomenological critique of the theoretical bases of science education. *Science & Education*, 10(5), 453-475.

- Dake, J. A., Price, J. H., & Telljohann, S. K. (2003). The nature and extent of bullying at school. *Journal of school health*, 73(5), 173-180.
- Donegan, R. (2012). Bullying and cyberbullying: History, statistics, law, prevention and analysis. *The Elon Journal of Undergraduate Research in Communications*, 3(1), 33-42.
- Edling, S., & Francia, G. (2016). Children's rights and violence: A case analysis at a Swedish boarding school. *Childhood*.
- Elfstrom, J. L. (2007). *Bullying and victimization: School climate matters* (Doctoral dissertation, Miami University).
- Espelage, D. L. (2014). Ecological theory: Preventing youth bullying, aggression, and victimization. *Theory into Practice*, 53(4), 257-264.
- Espelage, D. L., Gutsell, E. W., & Swearer, S. M. (Eds.). (2004). *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention*. routledge.
- Espelage, D. L., Polanin, J. R., & Low, S. K. (2014). Teacher and staff perceptions of school environment as predictors of student aggression, victimization, and willingness to intervene in bullying situations. *School psychology quarterly*, 29(3), 287.
- Flaspohler, P. D., Elfstrom, J. L., Vanderzee, K. L., Sink, H. E., & Birchmeier, Z. (2009). Stand by me: The effects of peer and teacher support in mitigating the impact of bullying on quality of life. *Psychology in the Schools*, 46(7), 636-649.
- Fontes, N. V. (2014). *Voices from the Warfront on the Battle against Bullying: Teachers' Perceptions of Bullying among Male and Female Students within Their School* (Doctoral dissertation, California State University, Sacramento).
- Fossey, E., Harvey, C., McDermott, F., & Davidson, L. (2002). Understanding and evaluating qualitative research. *Australian and New Zealand journal of psychiatry*, 36(6), 717-732.

- Fox, C. L., & Boulton, M. J. (2005). The social skills problems of victims of bullying: Self, peer and teacher perceptions. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75(2), 313-328.
- Gini, G. (2006). Bullying as a social process: The role of group membership in students' perception of inter-group aggression at school. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44(1), 51-65.
- Goldsmid, S., & Howie, P. (2014). Bullying by definition: an examination of definitional components of bullying. *Emotional and behavioural difficulties*, 19(2), 210-225.
- Goryl, O., Neilsen-Hewett, C., & Sweller, N. (2013). Teacher education, teaching experience and bullying policies: Links with early childhood teachers' perceptions and attitudes to bullying. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 38(2), 32.
- Hady, A. (2012). *Pesantren Gontor: its educational reform and contribution to the creation of a prominent santri network*. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of New South Wales)
- Hazler, R. J., Miller, D. L., Carney, J. V., & Green, S. (2001). Adult recognition of school bullying situations. *Educational Research*, 43(2), 133-146.
- Holubek, V. (2015). What is higher education all about from the student perspective? Phenomenographic study on student experiences.
- Hymel, S., & Swearer, S. M. (2015). Four decades of research on school bullying: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 70(4), 293.
- Kahane, R. (1988). Multicode organizations: A conceptual framework for the analysis of boarding schools. *Sociology of Education*, 211-226.
- Keltner, D., Capps, L., Kring, A. M., Young, R. C., & Heerey, E. A. (2001). Just teasing: a conceptual analysis and empirical review. *Psychological bulletin*, 127(2), 229.
- Kennedy, T. D., Russom, A. G., & Kevorkian, M. M. (2012). Teacher and administrator perceptions of bullying in schools. *International journal of education policy and leadership*, 7(5).

- Land, D. (2003). Teasing apart secondary students' conceptualizations of peer teasing, bullying and sexual harassment. *School Psychology International*, 24(2), 147-165.
- Losey, R. A. (2009). *An Evaluation of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program's Effectiveness in a High School Setting* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati).
- Mack, N., Woodsong, C., MacQueen, K. M., Guest, G., & Namey, E. (2005). Qualitative research methods: a data collector field guide.
- Mann, M. J., Kristjansson, A. L., Sigfusdottir, I. D., & Smith, M. L. (2015). The Role of Community, Family, Peer, and School Factors in Group Bullying: Implications for School- Based Intervention. *Journal of school health*, 85(7), 477-486.
- Marshall, M. L., Varjas, K., Meyers, J., Graybill, E. C., & Skoczylas, R. B. (2009). Teacher responses to bullying: Self-reports from the front line. *Journal of school violence*, 8(2), 136-158.
- Monks, C. P., & Smith, P. K. (2006). Definitions of bullying: Age differences in understanding of the term, and the role of experience. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 24(4), 801-821.
- Naylor, P., Cowie, H., Cossin, F., Bettencourt, R., & Lemme, F. (2006). Teachers' and pupils' definitions of bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(3), 553-576.
- Nilan, P. (2009). The 'spirit of education' in Indonesian pesantren. *British journal of sociology of education*, 30(2), 219-232.
- Nishina, A., Juvonen, J., & Witkow, M. R. (2005). Sticks and stones may break my bones, but names will make me feel sick: The psychosocial, somatic, and scholastic consequences of peer harassment. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 34(1), 37-48.
- Niska, J. (2014). Learner beliefs on English language learning among a group of junior secondary school CLIL pupils: a case study.

- Oliver, C., & Candappa, M. (2007). Bullying and the politics of 'telling'. *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(1), 71-86.
- Padgett, S., & Notar, C. E. (2013). Bystanders Are the Key to Stopping Bullying. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 1(2), 33-41.
- Parault, S. J., Davis, H. A., & Pellegrini, A. D. (2007). The social contexts of bullying and victimization. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 27(2), 145-174.
- Parylo, O. (2012). Qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods: An analysis of research design in articles on principal professional development (1998–2008). *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 6(3), 297-313.
- Pfeiffer, J. P., & Pinquart, M. (2014). Bullying in German boarding schools: A pilot study. *School Psychology International*, 35(6), 580-591.
- Pfeiffer, J. P., Pinquart, M., & Krick, K. (2016). Social Relationships, Prosocial Behaviour, and Perceived Social Support in Students from Boarding Schools. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 0829573516630303.
- Pietkiewicz, I., & Smith, J. A. (2014). A practical guide to using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis in qualitative research psychology. *Psychological Journal*, 20(1), 7-14.
- Pohl, F. (2006). Islamic education and civil society: Reflections on the pesantren tradition in contemporary Indonesia. *Comparative Education Review*, 50(3), 389-409.
- Rabah, J. Y., & Vlaardingerbroek, B. (2005). Teachers' and administrators' perceptions of the bullying problem in Lebanon. *Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies*, 10(2), 115-123.
- Rahmawati, S. (2016). *Hubungan Antara Kecemasan Perpisahan Dengan Orang Tua Terhadap Risiko Perilaku Bullying Santri di Pesantren Assanusi Cirebon*.

- Raihani, R. (2001). Curriculum construction in the Indonesian pesantren: a comparative case study of curriculum development in two pesantrens in South Kalimantan.
- Raihani, R. (2012). Report on multicultural education in pesantren. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 42(4), 585-605.
- Repo, L. (2015). Bullying and its prevention in early childhood education.
- Rigby, K. (2014). How teachers address cases of bullying in schools: a comparison of five reactive approaches. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 30(4), 409-419.
- Rigby, K. (2002). *New perspectives on bullying*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Robinson, H. (1994). Perception. *The Problems of Philosophy*. Routledge.
- Sahruli, I. B. (2014). *Pengaruh bullying terhadap prestasi belajar siswa di madrasah aliyah Ummatan Wasathan Pondok Pesantren Teknologi Riau* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Sarif Kasim Riau).
- Salmivalli, C. (2010). Bullying and the peer group: A review. *Aggression and violent behavior*, 15(2), 112-120.
- Sekol, I. (2016, June). Bullying in adolescent residential care: the influence of the physical and social residential care environment. In *Child & Youth Care Forum* (Vol. 45, No. 3, pp. 409-431). Springer US.
- Shapiro, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., & Kessler, J. W. (1991). A three-component model of children's teasing: Aggression, humor, and ambiguity. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 10(4), 459-472.
- Smith, P. K., Cowie, H., Olafsson, R. F., & Liefhoghe, A. P. (2002). Definitions of bullying: A comparison of terms used, and age and gender differences, in a Fourteen–Country international comparison. *Child development*, 73(4), 1119-1133.

- Smith, H., Varjas, K., Meyers, J., Marshall, M. L., Ruffner, C., & Graybill, E. C. (2009). Teachers' perceptions of teasing in schools. *Journal of School Violence*, 9(1), 2-22.
- Snyder, J., Brooker, M., Patrick, M. R., Snyder, A., Schrepferman, L., & Stoolmiller, M. (2003). Observed peer victimization during early elementary school: Continuity, growth, and relation to risk for child antisocial and depressive behavior. *Child Development*, 74(6), 1881-1898.
- Sourander, A., Jensen, P., Rönning, J. A., Niemelä, S., Helenius, H., Sillanmäki, L., ... & Almqvist, F. (2007). What is the early adulthood outcome of boys who bully or are bullied in childhood? The Finnish "From a Boy to a Man" study. *Pediatrics*, 120(2), 397-404.
- Srimulyani, E. (2007). Muslim Women and Education in Indonesia: The pondok pesantren experience. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 27(1), 85-99.
- Styles, E. A. (2005). *Attention, perception and memory: an integrated introduction*. Psychology Press.
- Tattum, D. (1997). A whole-school response: From crisis management to prevention. *The Irish Journal of Psychology*, 18(2), 221-232.
- Van Rensburg, E. J., & Raubenheimer, J. (2015). Does forgiveness mediate the impact of school bullying on adolescent mental health? *Journal of Child & Adolescent Mental Health*, 27(1), 25-39.
- Vignato, S. (2012). Devices of oblivion: how Islamic schools rescue 'orphaned' children from traumatic experiences in Aceh (Indonesia). *South East Asia Research*, 20(2), 239-261.
- Williford, A., Boulton, A., Noland, B., Little, T. D., Kärnä, A., & Salmivalli, C. (2012). Effects of the KiVa anti-bullying program on adolescents' depression, anxiety, and perception of peers. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, 40(2), 289-300.
- Yoon, J. S. (2004). Predicting teacher interventions in bullying situations. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 37-45.

- Yoon, J., & Kerber, K. (2003). Bullying: Elementary teachers' attitudes and intervention strategies. *Research in Education*, 69(1), 27-35.
- Younger, A. J., Schwartzman, A. E., & Ledingham, J. E. (1985). Age-related changes in children's perceptions of aggression and withdrawal in their peers. *Developmental Psychology*, 21(1), 70.
- Younger, A. J., Schwartzman, A. E., & Ledingham, J. E. (1986). Age-related differences in children's perceptions of social deviance: Changes in behavior or in perspective? *Developmental Psychology*, 22(4), 531.

APPENDIX 1

CONSENT FORM OF INTERVIEW WITH AUDIOTAPING

Consent to Participate in Research

Title of Study

“Teachers’ Perceptions and their Intervention toward Bullying at Aceh Modern Islamic Boarding Schools (*Pesantren*)”

Introduction and Purpose

Our name is Marthunis and Nailul Authar. We are graduate student at Tampere University, Finland, in the Department of Education. We would like to invite you to take part in our research study, which concerns on teachers’ perceptions and their interventions toward bullying at Aceh Islamic Boarding School (*Pesantren*).

Procedures

If you agree to participate in my research, we will conduct an interview with you at a time and location of your choice. The interview will involve questions about behaviors considered as bullying, perceptions on bullying issue, and the interventions employed on the issue. With your permission, we will audiotape and take notes during the interview. The recording is to accurately record the information you provide, and will be used for transcription purposes. If you choose not to be audiotaped, I will take notes instead. If you agree to be audiotaped but feel uncomfortable at any time during the interview, I can turn off the recorder at your request. Or if you don't wish to continue, you can stop the interview at any time.

We expect to conduct only one interview; however, follow-up may be needed to add the clarification. If so, we will contact you by mail/phone to request this.

Benefits

There is no direct benefit to you from taking part in this study. But, it is hoped that the research will contribute positively to the academic discourse on bullying issue and also expand new perspective on the strategy of tackling bullying issue within Islamic Boarding Schools institution.

Risks/Discomforts

Some of the research questions may make you uncomfortable or upset. You are free to decline to answer any questions you don't wish to, or to stop the interview at any time. As with all research, there is a chance that confidentiality could be compromised; however, we are taking precautions to minimize this risk.

Confidentiality

Your study data will be handled as confidentially as possible. If results of this study are published or presented, individual names and other personally identifiable information will not be used. When the research is completed, we may save the tapes and notes for use in future research done by ourselves or others.

Compensation

You will not be paid for taking part in this study.

Rights

Participation in research is completely voluntary. You are free to decline to take part in the project. You can decline to answer any questions and are free to stop taking part in the project at any time. Whether or not you choose to participate in the research and whether or not you choose to answer a question or continue participating in the project, there will be no penalty to you or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Questions

If you have any questions about this research, please feel free to contact us. we can be reached at [0853-7366-2708] [marthunisbukhari@gmail.com] and at [0852-6076-5246] [nailulauthar@hotmail.com]

CONSENT

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your own records.

If you wish to participate in this study, please sign and date below.

Participant's Name (*please print*)

Participant's Signature	Date
-------------------------	------

[Optional/If applicable]

If you agree to allow your name or other identifying information to be included in all final reports, publications, and/or presentations resulting from this research, please sign and date below.

Participant's Signature	Date
-------------------------	------

APPENDIX 2

Observation Protocol

Title of Study

“Teachers’ Perceptions and their Intervention toward Bullying at Aceh Modern Islamic Boarding Schools (*Pesantren*)”

Introduction and Purpose

Nailul Authar and I (Marthunis) will conduct the research which concerns on teachers’ perceptions and their Intervention toward Bullying at Aceh Modern Islamic Boarding Schools (*Pesantren*). In this research, we will use participant observation.

Procedures

The observation concerning activities considered as bullying, and the interventions employed by teachers at Islamic Boarding Schools on bullying issue will be conducted overtly. It is where the researchers reveal the true identity and purpose to the group and asks permission to observe. The method of recording the data is by using narrative recording through field-note taking. The researchers will record all occurrences obtained which related to activities considered as bullying, and the interventions employed by teachers at Islamic Boarding Schools on this issue. All other types of behavior except those are ignored. The observation will be performed from 4 pm to 11 pm. The idea of observing within the range of time because teachers and students at Islamic Boarding Schools will take part on many informal activities which bullying vulnerable to occur at that time. Therefore, the researchers assume that it will be the best time to observe activities deliberated as bullying and how the teachers intervene on it. Whether the teachers consider a certain behavior as bullying or not will be confirmed on the interview section in order to find out their perceptions on this issue. Here, we attach a table which will be used for our observation project of this study.

Date :

No.	Time	Observed Items	
		Behaviors Considered as Bullying	The Way of Teachers Intervene Bullying Behaviors
1.	4 p.m.		
2.	5 p.m.		
3.	6 p.m.		
4.	7 p.m.		
5.	8 p.m.		
6.	9 p.m.		
7.	10 p.m.		
8.	11 p.m.		

APPENDIX 3

In-depth Interview Questions

I. The Schedule of Interview

1. Day/Date :
2. Time :

II. Informant Identity

1. Name :
2. Gender :
3. Age :
4. Occupation :
5. Education :

III. Interview questions

A. Behaviors considered as bullying

1. Within students' daily interaction, did you notice teasing, name-calling, taunting, or threatening to cause harm?
2. If yes, what do you call for these types of behaviors?
3. Did you remark leaving someone out on purpose, telling other children not to be friends with someone, spreading rumors about someone, embarrassing someone in public
4. If yes, what do you name for these kinds of behaviors?
5. Did you spot hitting/kicking/pinching, spitting, tripping/pushing, taking or breaking someone's things or making mean or rude hand gestures?
6. If yes, what do you call for these types of behaviors?
7. Do students in this school frequently report of being bullied by others?

B. Bullying perceptions

1. Did you know what is bullying?
2. What kind of bullying behavior do you usually face within students' daily interaction?
3. What kind of bullying behavior is commonly occur among students?
4. How do you perceive all of those behaviors as questioned previously?
5. What do you think if teasing or name calling are considered as ordinary behavior within the school regulation?
6. Have you ever been trained on how to tackle bullying behaviors?

C. Intervention model on bullying

1. What do you do getting along if you notice a student or a group of students threatening to cause harm to another students?
2. What do you do getting along if you see a student or a group of students tease or embarrass someone in public area?
3. What do you do getting along if you remark a student or a group of students hit another student?
4. Does the school provide any regulation on how to prevent bullying?
5. If yes, could you describe types of concrete regulation applied to prevent bullying?
6. If no, why the school does not provide any concrete regulation/intervention to deter bullying?
7. Personally, what kind of intervention have you been doing to prevent bullying behavior?
8. Do you think that you employ an appropriate intervention? If yes, why?
9. What kind of potential solution that you think as the best way to treat this issue within this environment?